

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XLII, No. 20
WHOLE No. 1065

February 22, 1930

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	465-468
EDITORIAL	
Prayers for Russia—Must Congress Act?—Mr. Marshall's Refuge—Stupid Legislation—Bigotry in the Senate—An Advocate for Birth Control	469-471
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
A Mystic's Influence in Colonial America—How Stands the Advance?—Laymen on a College Council—Critics and Heretics—Consider the Business Man.....	472-479
EDUCATION	
Unpractical Education	479-480
SOCIOLOGY	
"Claim to be Catholics" in Jail.....	481-482
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.....	482-483
POETRY	
Ebb Tide—He Who Rides the Sky—Pierced Quiet	474; 476; 483
DRAMATICS	
Plays Worth Discussing.....	484-485
REVIEWS	485-487
COMMUNICATIONS	488

Chronicle

Home News.—The Prohibition agitation received a still greater impetus when, on February 12, the House Judiciary Committee began its promised hearings with unlimited permission for the witnesses to agitate for repeal or modification of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. The Chairman of the Committee, Representative George S. Graham, opened the hearing with a vigorous statement against Prohibition. Prominent leaders on both sides were expected to be heard. On February 7, Representative Beck had made an important contribution to the whole question. In a purely constitutional plea, he distinguished between the mandatory provisions of the Constitution and others which are merely permissive. He ranked the Eighteenth Amendment among the latter and declared Congress is under no obligation to retain the Volstead Act or any enforcing act on the books. On February 8, the Williamson bill transferring Prohibition enforcement from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice was approved without a roll call. Only four voices were raised against it. Senator Wheeler, however, a "dry," announced that he would move to investigate the honesty of Prohibition enforcement.

Prohibition

The debate in the Senate over the appointment of Charles Evans Hughes to be Chief Justice of the United States revealed a deep cleavage in political theory now existing in the country. Those classed generally as "radicals," "liberals," "progressives," took the stand that Mr. Hughes was temperamentally a proponent of the rights of the privileged classes as against the rights of the people as a whole. This was the stand of Messrs. Borah and Norris. The bulk of the Republicans, according to tradition, defended Mr. Hughes' record while not denying his bias. The Republican doctrine of the general good sought through class privilege was proclaimed in his favor. For a time it looked as if the opposition to him would grow but since only a majority vote was needed to confirm the nomination and since the liberal elements in the Senate are in the minority, an easy victory for Mr. Hughes was looked for from the start. He was confirmed by a vote of 52 to 26.

On February 10, in a Monday morning release, seven important farm organizations attacked the present state of the tariff bill's rates as prejudicial to the interests of the farmers. The defeat of the high rates on sugar, molasses, casein and hides was cited to show that the Senate had proved false to the President's position that "an adequate tariff is the foundation of farm relief." The farmers claimed that the tariff rates were still discriminatory.

Tariff Bill

Belgium.—Wide comment was caused throughout the country following a letter of King Albert, personally and directly addressed to the press, defending the work of the emergency Government established in the small Flemish village of Lophem at the end of the War when the rest of the country was still occupied by the Germans. Charges had been made that the acts of this Government were illegal because not voted by two-thirds of the regular national Parliament. His Majesty's letter approved the Lophem legislation, which was mostly of an extremely democratic character, including the extension of the franchise.—In Antwerp, on February 9, following a demonstration by the Activists, their headquarters were raided by the police to remove a banner placed there to attract the attention of Prince Leopold and Princess Astrid when they were attending a theater opposite. The banner read, "If we cannot have our rights we will not support our country or our King." The principal grievance of the Activists is the failure of the Government to provide a wholly Flemish university in the country.

Varia

Brazil.—On February 7, Vice-President Fernando Mello Vianna was wounded, five people were killed, and fourteen others hurt in a shooting affray attending a political demonstration at Montes Carlos, an interior town 700 miles northwest of Rio de Janeiro. Dr. Mello Vianna was at the time completing a campaign trip for the coming presidential election. Political foes were blamed for the affray. The shooting of the Vice-President, though his wounds were not serious, caused great excitement throughout the country, and the regular troops and militia were ordered to stand by at their post and be prepared for eventualities. However, there were no indications that any wide revolutionary movement was being fomented. Rather President Luis received assurances of loyalty from many quarters, including the Municipal Chamber of Sao Paulo, Governors, Senators and Deputies in different parts of the country, and from diplomatic officials in Rio de Janeiro.

Electrical Dispute

Chile.—On February 10, President Ibañez published an open letter in which he explicitly stated that he would not approve a pending contract with the Electric Bond and Share Company of New York, on the score that it was a one-sided document openly favoring the Americans and detrimental to Chilean national interests. The press had previously severely criticized the various commissions and Francisco Lobos, Director of the Electrical Services of the Republic, for the drafting of the contract which, it was maintained, would establish a monopoly. Subsequently an open letter was addressed to the editors of the three Santiago newspapers representing the chief opposition, by the Chilean Electrical Company, closely associated with the New York concern, declaring its readiness to abandon the contract that aroused the unfavorable criticism and draft a new one. The trouble over the country's electrical problem started, according to a dispatch to the New York Times, with the mass resignation of all staff employees of the Bureau of Electric Services of the Republic, which was addressed directly to the President, expressing the opinion that it was impossible for them to continue working under Sr. Lobos, since the head of the department carried out his duties without consulting the technical staff, simply using his own discretion in such important matters as the granting of concessions and contracts.

Colombia.—On February 9 presidential elections were held. The results favored Dr. Enrique Olaya Herrera, Minister to the United States, the Liberal-Coalition candidate, who polled a large majority over both his important rivals, Dr. Guillermo Valencia and General Alfredo Vasquez Cobo, representing the split Conservative ticket. The fourth candidate, Alberto Castrillon, candidate of the Socialist-Revolutionary party, polled a relatively small vote. The elections passed in an orderly manner despite the hot contest that had preceded them, and it was estimated that the largest vote in the country's history was cast. The new President is forty-eight years old and originally a

Liberal in politics. He ran for the presidency on a ticket in which he emphasized the broad national views of the country, particularly along economic lines, and stood for a program of friendship in Colombia toward foreign investments there. Educated at the National University of Bogota and then at schools in Belgium and France, he began his public career as an editor. He has been twice Foreign Minister and both Senator and Representative. In 1922 he resigned his portfolio as Foreign Minister to become Minister to the United States. The Liberal party in Colombia has been uniformly anti-Catholic, while the Conservatives, in power for over forty years, supported the Church.

Egypt.—Avoiding a debate in Parliament on the terms of the draft treaty drawn up between the British Labor Government and the former Premier, Mahmoud Pasha, the Wafdist Government merely sought, and obtained, a mandate from Parliament to re-open negotiations with the British Government on the basis of the proposals in the draft treaty. The opposition registered but five votes. Premier Nahas Pasha stated that any treaty resulting from these negotiations would be submitted to the Deputies for the fullest possible discussion.

France.—The debate on the social-insurance law in the Chamber, which brought the Premier from London on February 7, closed with a vote of confidence in the Government on February 8, by a count of 315 to 257. By an act passed last summer, the new plan should have been in operation early in February, but protests from industrialists and other groups won postponement till July, 1930. Under the terms of the project, 9,000,000 workers would be insured against death, accident, illness, or unemployment, and special benefits provided for maternity, old age, and disability. Premiums would be paid jointly by workers, employers, and the State, in the approximate ratio of 3-3-2. Opposition came from many quarters. Conservative economists feared a general increase in commodity costs, and hardship for employers of farm labor. Leaders of independent social-action groups saw in some of the clauses an excessive centralization of control, and a desire to "laicize" all social service. Compromises and amendments are expected to make the measure acceptable in the next few months, so that it can be put in operation before the summer.—The disappearance of General Koutieppoff still baffled the police. Several clues proved fruitless, and hostility to the Soviets was unabated.

Germany.—On February 11, Germany's new reparations agreements were submitted to the Reichstag for ratification. These included the "New Plan," as the Young plan is officially known, the separate agreement with the United States and various liquidation compacts concluded under the provisions of Section X of the Treaty of Versailles. The liquidation compact initiated by Germany and Poland encountered strong opposition from the

Mandate for Treaty Negotiations

Social Insurance

Reparations Program

five coalition parties comprising the present Government: the Socialists, Centrists, German People's party, the Democrats, and the Bavarian People's party. All except the last approved the new arrangement which is to replace the Dawes plan. The Bavarian People's party had not yet indicated its attitude. The presentation of the Government's arrangements was made by Dr. Julius Curtius, the Foreign Minister and the initial discussion promised no variations until Dr. Alfred Hugenberg, the Nationalist leader, made his first active appearance in the Reichstag since the collapse of his referendum for outlawing the Young plan. In reply to the Nationalist leader, the Foreign Minister denied that the plan carried sanctions for reoccupying the Rhineland or that it fostered a Bolshevik menace. After weighing the advantages of the new reparations plan compact, Dr. Curtius requested the Reichstag to give it its sanction. The five laws and nineteen treaties comprising the Reich's new reparations program were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the main budget committee.

Great Britain.—Protests against the religious persecution in Soviet Russia were made by Cardinal Bourne as well as by the Anglican Convocations held at Canterbury and York. Cardinal Bourne stressed the idea that such protests were not to be classed as interference with the national affairs of other nations. He declared, according to the *New York Times*, that "those at the foot of things in Russia are determined to do the same in every country of the world." At the Canterbury Convocation, Dr. Cosmo Gordon Lang proposed the resolution, which was adopted, that:

The House records its indignant protest against the persecution of all who profess any form of religion in Russia, and offers its heartfelt sympathy to those suffering through this persecution, calls upon all members of the church to unite in prayer to God in their behalf, and expresses its conviction that if the Soviet Government desires satisfactory relations with this Government to be maintained, it must observe the principles of just and humane civilization.

Dr. Lang, expressing approval of the recent declaration of Pope Pius XI, ordered prayers for Russia in all the Anglican churches on March 16. At the York Convocation, Dr. William Temple, Anglican Archbishop of York, said: "No words can be too strong to express the indignation and the abhorrence with which we hear day by day the news of the revival of persecution such as is incompatible with the elementary principles of civilization."

Ireland.—With the reassembly of the Dail, the question of how Ernest Blythe, Minister of Finance, intended to balance the budget opened to its annual controversy.

Budget and Loans

On the one side, taxation had reached the limit beyond which it could not well be increased. On the other, the reductions in expenditures on the army and administrative departments cannot go much beyond those made in last year's budget. Supporters of the Government pointed out that the last budget, apart from extraordinary outlays such as those for the Shannon Scheme, drainage, etc., was bal-

anced wholly from revenues; in addition, that the national debt did not equal the income of one year.—The report that the Free State was seeking the flotation of another loan in New York was promptly denied by the Free State Minister to Washington, Michael MacWhite. He stated: "The Free State Government has so far taken no decision with regard to the flotation of the second part of the 1928 loan, the authorized total of which is £15,000,000 (\$72,975,000)." Explanations of the reason for dealing with New York rather than London in seeking a loan centered about the fact that, under the terms of the Colonial Stock Act, "to have the loan registered as a trustee stock, the Free State must agree in advance to have disallowed any legislation which in the opinion of the British Government might prejudice the stockholder's interests." Such veto power, exercised by the British Parliament on Dominion legislation, was regarded by the Free State Government as objectionable.

Mexico.—The country remained quiet after the attempted assassination of President Ortiz Rubio. A number of alleged backers of the assassin were rounded up, including a priest from San Luis Potosi. The Government showed extreme reticence in fixing upon any group the responsibility for the act of the young man. On February 10, however, a raid was carried out upon the vacated Russian Embassy and large numbers of documents were seized. Whatever discoveries were made in these documents were not disclosed by the Government. On the same day, as he was leaving Vera Cruz, the former Soviet Ambassador was laid under arrest and his papers were seized for a few hours and then returned to him. Meanwhile, the new Administration, under the guidance of former President Portes Gil, began to work with little sign of a change from the former Administration. It would seem, however, that it would evolve along socialistic lines according to the plan outlined in the inaugural speech. Thus a definite and final break was made with Moscow which is as bitter against the Socialists as against any "bourgeois" party.

Poland.—After two months had practically been lost out of the five allotted to the budget debate, the new Cabinet, under Premier Bartel, succeeded in winning the cooperation of Parliament so effectively that the budgetary committee working day and night finished its work on February 1, and M. Daszynski, the speaker of the Sejm, safely steered the budget through its second reading in the full house. The new budgetary year begins April 1, at which time it was expected that the budget will have been confirmed by the Senate. Thus the Sejm performed its constitutional duty and showed its spirit of cooperation. A few cuts were made in the secret funds of several Ministers and 3,000,000,000 zloti (about \$337,500,000) were set for the Cabinet to carry out State business. It was stated that the Deputies feared that once the budget was passed, Marshal Pilsudski might send them home as he did last year; but confidence in M. Bartel strengthened

Political Conditions

Budget Readings

the conviction that the "Colonels" would remain inactive. —Otto Strandman, President of the Republic of Estonia, was warmly greeted on his visit to Warsaw and was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws by the University of Warsaw. The entire diplomatic corps took part in all the functions that were held to honor the visitor, with the single exception of the Russian envoy who left Warsaw on the eve of the President's arrival.

Vatican City.—Solemn services of reparation for the Soviet persecution and proscription of religion were set for the feast of St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, in a letter of the Pope addressed on February 8 to Cardinal Pompili, Vicar of Rome. The Holy Father invited the whole Christian world to participate in the public act of reparation and to pray for the restoration of religious freedom to the persecuted people of Russia. He recalled his continued anxiety, his efforts at conciliation, the course of the Papal relief work, and the long series of outrages on the part of the Soviets culminating in the blasphemies and desecration of the last Christmas season in Russia. The letter was widely quoted in the secular and religious press, and found immediate echo in the Anglican Church Convocations in England, and in a joint meeting of Protestants, Jews, and Russian Orthodox at Paris.

The *Osservatore Romano* of February 11 carried the letter of Pope Pius accepting the resignation of His Eminence Pietro Cardinal Gasparri from the post of Papal Secretary of State, and formally announced the appointment of Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli as his successor. Cardinal Gasparri's career includes an extended series of important posts, from his appointment as Apostolic Delegate to Peru, Ecuador, and Chile in 1898, and as Secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1901. He was raised to the Cardinalate by Pope Pius X in 1907, and to the Secretaryship of State under Pope Benedict XV on October 13, 1914. Pope Pius XI, on his accession, immediately reappointed him to the latter post. In 1904 he was charged with the tremendous task of preparing the codification of Canon Law, completed in 1917. Since that date he had also presided over the Commission for the Interpretation of the Code. At the time of his resignation he was almost seventy-eight years old.

Cardinal Pacelli, the new Secretary of State, was consecrated titular Bishop of Sardis in 1917, and was elevated to the Cardinalate in the consistory of December 16, 1929, shortly after his return from the post of Nuncio at Berlin, where he had successfully negotiated the Concordat with Prussia. Prior to his appointment to Berlin, he had occupied a similar post at Munich, and concluded the Bavarian Concordat. He is a brother of S. Francesco Pacelli, Counselor of the Vatican State, who acted as negotiator for the Vatican in preparing the Lateran Treaty and Concordat.

The eighth anniversaries of the election and coronation

of Pope Pius XI were observed on February 6 and 12, respectively. On the latter date the Holy Father assisted at a Solemn Mass in the Sistine Chapel, attended by the Cardinals in residence and the diplomatic corps. King Gustav of Sweden was also present. The Pontiff received numerous congratulatory messages, marking the occasion and its coincidence with the first anniversary of the Lateran settlement.

Disarmament.—Mr. MacDonald, on February 7, proposed, if battleships could not be abolished, a construction holiday until 1935, and reducing size of ships and guns, respectively, to 25,000 tons and twelve inches, all capital ships to be reduced in 1931 to the level required by the Washington treaty for 1936; the Washington allotment for aircraft carriers, for Britain and America, to be reduced from 135,000 to 100,000 tons; maximum size to be from 25,000 to 10,000 tons; one class for all cruisers; limitation of cruisers both by guns and tonnage; limitation of destroyers; abolition of submarines; and failing that, making them purely defensive: "humanizing" them as to merchant vessels.

The last-mentioned point was agreed to by the French, who were ready to promise that submarines should follow the rules of surface craft. Senator Borah's proposal of an American battleship to match the British Rodney met with "No" on the part of the British First Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Stimson, speaking on submarines, warned of their danger as war breeders, and admitted the possibility of another war. French alarm was voiced at the common ground apparently reached by the British and the Americans. On the other hand, figures showed, as given in the *New York Times* for February 13, how far behind at present is the United States in craft actually built: United States only two 10,000-ton cruisers to Britain's eleven; United States build 200,000 tons to get her allotted eighteen of said class; its destroyers practically all out of date by 1936; same as to submarines. Even with a battleship holiday, \$500,000,000 would be needed to build up to parity; though it would still save us \$400,000,000. In the classification of cruisers, the American delegation rigidly adhered to limitation by guns only, not by tonnage.

A year ago Grace H. Sherwood wrote a piece about her book rack. Next week she will tell of "The Book Rack's Second Birthday."

John Gibbons, who went tramping to Lourdes and adventuring in Southern Italy, and told about it in *AMERICA*, will write of his latest wanderings—in Hungary.

Is there an intrinsic difficulty in writing a Catholic novel that makes one dull or turns one into a preacher? An answer will be attempted in a series of two articles by Robert A. Parsons, of which the first will be called "Interesting yet Catholic."

Cardinal Pacelli
New Secretary
of State

Coronation
Anniversary

British
Proposals

Some
Comparisons

Reparation
for Soviet
Persecution

Cardinal
Gasparri
Retires

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1930

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS

Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
CHARLES I. DOYLE
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JAMES A. GREELEY

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

Telephone: Medallion 3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

intercede for Russia, and he constitutes Ste. Thérèse of the Child Jesus as the special patron of that afflicted country. On March 19, the Feast of St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, the Holy Father will offer the Divine Sacrifice on the tomb of the Apostles, as a solemn act of expiation and propitiation.

Doubtless public novenas will be made in many places all over the world, in union with the intentions of the Holy Father, in preparation for this world-wide act of expiation. It is truly fitting that it should take place on the Feast of St. Joseph. Even as he was the protector of Our Blessed Lady and her Divine Child, so is he the protector of all Catholics everywhere, and of the whole Church of God. Further, St. Joseph, who as the head of the house guarded and taught the Child at Nazareth, has a father's heart for all children. Surely in memory of the days in Nazareth, he will intercede with his Divine Foster-Son for the poor little ones who suffer anguish of body, and the deeper anguish of soul, in afflicted Russia.

Prayers for Russia

THE interest of Pius XI in Russia has never abated. At the very outset of his pontificate, he addressed the Governments then in session at Genoa, asking them to require from the Soviets, freedom of conscience, freedom of religious worship, and the inviolability of property rights, as a condition of recognition. But his plea went unheard. Abandoned by these Governments, the Holy Father began his magnificent work of relief, by sending a relief commission into Russia, under the Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., of Georgetown University.

But conditions have grown steadily worse. Thousands have been put to death for no other reason than their refusal to blaspheme Almighty God, and millions are held in a bondage far more imperious and degrading than was ever known under the worst of the Czars. As the Holy Father has recently written to his Cardinal Vicar, the necessary result of the prevailing tyranny is moral, cultural and economic degradation.

What fills the heart of the Pontiff with deepest grief, is the deliberate purpose of the Government to give young people an "education" which "will contaminate their souls with all the vices, and with the most shameless materialistic aberrations. The promoters of these iniquities wish to strike at religion and at God Himself, and to bring about the ruination of minds, and even of human nature itself." These charges are borne out to the full, not indeed by the confessions of the tyrants now in power in Russia, but by their open boast. They realize that they cannot destroy civilization until they have degraded the soul of man. Hence they strive to delete the very name of God from God's world, and they begin by training youth to indulge in all manner of blasphemies against God and His law.

The Holy Father invites his children all over the world to join him in a solemn and public act of reparation for these dreadful crimes. He calls upon those great heroes of the Church in the East, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, St. Nicholas, and Saints Cyril and Methodius, to

Must Congress Act?

FOR the opinion of the Hon. James M. Beck on any constitutional question, we entertain great respect. Mr. Beck is a lawyer of distinction, a student of government who has served as Solicitor General of the United States, and now represents in Congress a district from Pennsylvania. In addition to his book on the Constitution, Mr. Beck has done much by his speeches and popular addresses to stir up public interest in problems of government.

His speech in Congress on February 7 should be reprinted and widely circulated. It does not outline a policy which will be adopted immediately, or even in the near future. Its value lies in its clear exposition of principles which must be kept steadily before the public if ever we are to break away from "that monstrous compound of iniquity and folly" which is Volsteadism and the spirit which vitalizes it.

The present Congress is overwhelmingly "dry." The cause of good government has lost the services of such men as former Senator Bruce, of Maryland, and of "Reed of Missouri" never happier than when he could exercise his brilliant powers of exposition and of cross-examination upon popular frauds seeking constitutional sanction. The dries are, emphatically, in the saddle. Honest reapportionment of Congress, a constitutional mandate which no dry has ever urged, will make them reel; a campaign of instruction on the incompatibility of nationwide sumptuary legislation with the principles of American constitutional government, will unhorse them. Hence it is of vital importance that addresses such as Mr. Beck's be given the widest publicity.

As we understand him, Mr. Beck's central argument is founded on the distinction between a clause which enjoins a certain course upon Congress, and a clause which merely vests Congress with the right to adopt that course. Thus, Congress is directed to reapportion its members according to the decennial census, and to create certain inferior courts. Congress is not free to disregard these

mandates, although a dry Congress has done so in the matter of reapportionment. Again, the Constitution vests Congress with general power to regulate commerce between the States, but makes the method of regulation, if any, a question of political discretion. "In other words," said Mr. Beck in his speech of February 7, "the Constitution grants to Congress many powers and states many objectives, but often leaves to the political discretion of Congress the question as to the manner of their exercise or, indeed, whether they shall be exercised at all."

It is Mr. Beck's opinion that the powers granted to Congress by the Eighteenth Amendment are of this nature. That opinion we share. Congress may exercise these powers, but it need not, thus leaving the attainment of the objectives of the Amendment to be dealt with by the several States.

Mr. Marshall's Refuge

WRITING to the New York *World* in comment on the Rev. Dr. George Johnson's masterly discussion of the recent Papal Encyclical on education, Mr. Charles C. Marshall has his customary vision of a menace to American liberties. "Mr. Johnson (*sic*)," he writes "presents the question raised by the Pope's encyclical as that of education vs. religion, whereas it is that of education vs. Roman Catholicism."

Just where this Papal menace lies, Mr. Marshall has never yet succeeded in making plain. The Catholic experiences no violence to freedom, since he accepts with freedom and love the guidance of him whom he regards as an authoritative Visible Teacher of God's revelation. And why should the non-Catholic be concerned, since he attaches no validity to the same Visible Teacher's commission? Since this same Teacher has no weapons save his own persuasiveness, it would seem that Mr. Marshall's periodic alarm might be changed to a deep thankfulness that there is at hand one more force for ethical idealism and civic decency in a much-distraught world.

His alarms, however, have this merit, that each brings out more clearly than its predecessor the radically Hegelian philosophy in which he has taken refuge. There is no ambiguity in the concluding lines of his letter just quoted (*italics ours*):

It will be impossible for many to see how social disorder and civic irresponsibility can be composed by a doctrine which engenders them and teaches to a part of the community that allegiance to an ecclesiastical ruler in Divine right is paramount to the allegiance owed the state in such fundamental matters as morals and education.

Knowingly or unknowingly, Mr. Marshall has made himself the propagandist of a philosophical theory which already, in modified form, has done to our country a harm that we now suffer from. If carried to its logical conclusion (as it is thus carried in the Soviet State), it will mean not only harm, but ruin for American civilization.

For, as Father Johnson remarks: "It is not the Pope who threatens American education; it is the State absolutist who has forgotten the principles on which our

democracy was founded." Mr. Marshall himself will acknowledge that "one of the major and underlying causes," as writes Hugh Moran, Fellow of the National Council of Religion, "perhaps the greatest, of our materialistic age is the lack of the spiritual element in our formal education." And the same writer continues:

Secularism has been carried so far that moral, and ethical instruction as well, has been practically barred from all public institutions. It is a result which the founders of the Republic never contemplated and certainly did not foresee. In this regard we are more intolerant and backward than China and Japan, where moral and ethical teaching form an important part of the public school system. Millions of our American children are growing up ignorant of the Ten Commandments, or of anything which might conceivably take their place.

But by putting State absolutism in the saddle; by turning over the individual's and the parent's conscience to the mercy of the lobbyist and the politician, Mr. Marshall, no matter how altruistic his wishes for good ethical influences, will have put the most effective obstacle in the way of the world's again realizing what the non-Catholic John Herman Randali calls the "greatest problem of the age": "the grasping of the essential unity between education and religion."

Stupid Legislation

IN 1920, a young woman stole two dresses, the property of a New York department store. In 1924, she stole a coat. In 1926, she stole another coat. In 1929, she stole two coats and a dress.

In 1930, a New York court sentenced her to the penitentiary for life.

It must be admitted that under the Baumes legislation, we run the gamut, as the New York *Times* expresses it, of all eccentricities. The judge who sentenced this young woman remarked that he paid a heavy price to serve the people of New York, and at once, in conjunction with the district attorney and the chief city magistrate, petitioned the Governor for pardon or commutation. Under the Baumes plan, all discretion was removed from the judge. For a fourth conviction on a felony charge, a life sentence is mandatory.

In any system of rational jurisprudence, the penalty inflicted must bear some reasonable relation to the crime. If it goes beyond certain limits, it is sheer cruelty or oppression, and is a penalty which no State may inflict. Thus, for instance, the Michigan statute, now repealed, under which a citizen could be jailed for life, if on four occasions he had been convicted of the high crime of possessing a gill of whiskey, was merely an exercise of cruelty by a fanatical majority.

To serve the purpose of justice, punishment should be proportional to the offense. To protect the public, it should be inflicted, surely and speedily. Mandatory legislation of the Baumes type meets neither of these ends. It is the brandishing of a club by a stupid and vengeful giant. Instead of promoting peace and good order, it stirs up resentment against the courts, already unpopular enough. Not six months ago, a banker, who by a most cruel unfaithfulness to trust stole millions of

dollars, was given a few years in the penitentiary. Hard on this case, a young woman is given life for the theft of a parcel of cheap wearing apparel. How can procedure of that type do anything but confirm the too popular error that courts are for the terror of poor criminals, and the protection of those who are rich?

An Advocate for Birth Control

PRECISELY what grievance the New York *Telegram* has against Germany and the Germans, we do not know. The *Telegram* thinks there are too many Germans, and suggests that Germany will do well to investigate the cause of her declining birth rate, in order to make it decline still further. "If Germany knows when she is well off, she will search for the cause of the declining birth rate," writes the editor. "But she will do so in order that the operative causes may be intensified."

On the whole, the *Telegram* has given us one of the most stupid and anti-Christian pronouncements that has appeared in any American journal for some years. The sole importance of the editorial is the fact that, appearing in a Scripps-Howard paper, it is probably syndicated, and will thus receive a wide circulation. We trust that decent citizens, who may happen to be subscribers, will consider, after reading it, whether the *Telegram* is a publication which they care to patronize.

Two arguments, we are told, are advanced for increased population, and we are left under the impression that these exhaust the case against birth control. The first is that attributed to Bismarck who, according to the editor, looked upon new flocks of children as so much "cannon fodder." The other argument "is to create new souls for salvation for the world to come." The cannon-fodder argument is rejected by the editor as "hardly appropriate." As to the second, "in our growing secular age the soul-factory theory is hardly more tenable."

We may pass over Bismarck. It is quite possible that this man of blood and iron may have used the language attributed to him. But we have never heard it used by any decent man as an argument against the use of chemical and mechanical means of interfering with the laws of nature. As far as we know, it was first suggested by the editor of the *Telegram*. Communicate with dealers in surgical and chemical appliances, is the burden of his advice, and then you can be guaranteed against bringing into the world any more cannon fodder.

As to the second argument, it is hardly probable that any man outside of bedlam has ever suggested that it is possible for a human being to create a soul. Finite man can create nothing. Man, body and soul alike, is the creation of Almighty God. Our acquaintance with the literature of the birth-control propaganda is fairly wide, but we have never heard an opponent of birth control assert that the souls of men are created by men.

"What is needed now," the *Telegram* gravely informs us, "is alarm over increasing birth rates." We venture a few amendments. What is needed now is alarm over decreasing self-control, and the spread of the pagan notion that marriage is merely another opportunity for self-

indulgence. To be honorable and upright often demands, in other fields of life, the highest degree of self-control, the willingness to suffer even death itself. In no less degree are these noble qualities demanded, when men and women assume the rights and duties of married life.

Our other amendment is of less importance. What is needed far more than any alarm "over increasing birth rates" is more common sense in the editorial office of the *Telegram*, and a check on one of its staff who loses no opportunity of wantonly attacking principles known to be defended by the Catholic Church. If this journal wishes to join the *Fellowship Forum* school, honesty requires a plain statement of its intentions.

Bigotry in the Senate

IT is difficult to imagine anything of less consequence than a speech by the senior Senator from Alabama. In itself, it will be worthless, but in its intent, it will quite commonly be repulsive. Less frequently, it furnishes honorable men with occasion for an effective retort.

Last October the Senator addressed a communication to a busybody in Philadelphia who professed great distress because in New York a Negro collegian had married a white woman. The senior Senator from Alabama asserted that this was done "with the hearty approval of the State and city government presided over by Governor Smith and Jimmie Walker," after which he proceeded to attack the Catholic Church as the prime cause of these "shocking, disgusting and sickening" facts. "The Roman Catholic Church permits Negroes and whites to belong to the same Catholic church, and to go to the same Catholic schools, and permits and sanctions the marriage between whites and Negroes." For once in his life, in discussing the Catholic Church, the Senator told the truth.

The Senator's correspondence is his own affair, but he made it public by having it inserted in the *Congressional Record*. Reading it there, Senator Copeland moved that it be expunged, as in violation of the Senate rule which forbids improper reflections upon any State. The Senate usually marks the importance which it attaches to utterances by the Senator from Alabama, by retiring to the cloakroom, but it remained to listen to the protest made by Senator Copeland. In the debate which followed, the bigotry and un-Christian spirit of the Senator from Alabama received due attention. To Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, we owe the fine paragraph:

Every church in New England, New York, Wisconsin, California, and in nearly all the States of the Union, receives on an equal basis in the worship of God colored people and white people. Are we to close the doors of the house of God to the few poor colored people who have come to the North and the West, and are unable to support a church of their own? Must we say, "None but whites can pray to God here? None but whites can love God here? None but whites can serve God here?" Is that the conception of religious tolerance that we are to preach and recognize in the Senate of the United States? God banish hate and jealousy and envy, religious and racial, from this land of ours.

All of which, it may be remarked, is completely above the apprehension of the senior Senator from Alabama.

A Mystic's Influence in Colonial America

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., PH.D.

ALMOST exactly 300 years ago, when she was about twenty-five years of age, a domestic servant in the city of Vannes in Brittany attracted attention from a number of devout people because in the midst of her work she was able to keep so in the presence of God that, without extraordinary manifestations of any kind except her intense love of prayer, she came to be looked upon by those who knew her as a saint. She was known as *la bonne Armelle*, and though she herself would have been one of the first to deprecate anything like reverential feeling toward her, for it would have shocked her humility, she continued to be the subject of reverence on the part of those who knew her. For several years she was a portress in the Ursuline convent at Vannes and was brought rather intimately into relation with Mother Jeanne de la Nativité, to whom she confided some of her experiences in the spiritual life. The good Armelle herself could neither read nor write, so Mother Jeanne, delegated by Armelle's confessor with the consent of her own Superior, began to commit to writing some of the details of the remarkable spiritual life of the convent's portress.

The most interesting extraneous feature of this biographic sketch, as taken down from the lips of Armelle by her Ursuline scrivener, is that an excerpt from the work describing her daily life for a single twenty-four hours was one of the very earliest printed books in English America, (the Spanish-American countries long anticipated us in all sorts of printing). This record of a day of Armelle's life was published in 1754 by Christopher Sower, Jr., the son of the well-known German printer whose name is often given in its German form Saur, and who set up a press in Germantown in the first half of the eighteenth century. Even more surprising than this, however, is that no less than four editions of this excerpt from Armelle's life were published in the colonial period. Mr. William Stetson Merrill, Librarian of the Newberry Library, Chicago, in his monograph on "Catholic Authorship in the American Colonies before 1784" (*Catholic Historical Review*, vol. III, p. 308) lists them. One was printed at Wilmington in 1762 by James Adams; a second by Henry Miller in Philadelphia in 1767; and a third (with the *editio princeps* of 1754 making the fourth) was printed also in Philadelphia by Joseph Cruikshanks (1780). There was evidently much more than passing interest in mystical writings in the Colonies, for there was a reprint of Fenelon's "Dissertation on Pure Love" and certain others of his works in several editions at this time.

It would seem as though such a book as the life of the good Armelle could not be of enduring interest. It might attract a modicum of attention when first issued in devout old-fashioned Brittany, but surely it would be destined for a brief career and a narrow circle of influence. As a matter of fact, however, this book has gone through a number of editions, and has been translated into three

or four languages. The most recent English edition (London, 1899) shows that the book still has an appeal. When a book has lived 300 years and successive generations for that length of time are interested in it, it must have been written from so close to the heart of human nature that it is always going to have an interest for many men.

In his introduction to the English edition, Edward Dowden, the well-known Irish litterateur and professor of English literature at Trinity College, Dublin, said of the life of Armelle: "I took the book as a thing lived and made out of life by somebody and as such having in all that is best its own self-verification." He had been deeply impressed by it and felt that the life of a domestic servant who did her household work faithfully and yet who became the subject of inner experiences so wonderful, is distinguished by its very modesty of circumstances.

The American excerpt from the good Armelle's writings contains only sixteen pages and it would be a very interesting thing to reprint it in as close an imitation of the original form as possible for Catholics in the modern time. In the original there are some 800 closely printed pages in two books, the first autobiographic and the second containing didactic material with regard to the spiritual life. As the English translator, Thomas Taylor Allen, says in the recent English edition, Armelle must not be taken for a mystic in the meaning of that word as it appeals to a great many people because of a false etymology, as if what she had written was full of mistiness and obscurity. The direct contrary is the truth with regard to mystics in general and Armelle in particular. She is as straightforward and forthright as can be. The true mystic is the seer who sees more than the rest of us and whose vision we borrow to enable us as far as possible to comprehend something of what is hidden from us.

Some of her expressions as they occur in the quaint, somewhat old-fashioned translation of the first American edition, will give a good idea of the spirit in which Armelle lived and the way in which she expressed her spiritual experiences of the inner life. To someone who had declared that it must be dreadful to be as much alone as she was, for she did not make many friends, though those she did make became very much attached to her, she replied: "Oh, if you knew what glorious company I have, you would not say that I was alone, for I am never less alone than when I have nobody with me."

Armelle thought that the worst distraction of the spiritual life was the looking for news which so many people indulged in:

When a certain person asked her whether she did not know a story that the town rang with at the time, she answered, "No," and gave God thanks that she never knew anything of the news of this world, neither did she desire to know, but she knew a great deal of news concerning the love and mercies of Almighty God, for this she said was the only thing she desired to know, and wherewith her heart was entirely taken up.

Toward the end of her life, which came amid a great deal of suffering, borne with the greatest peace and without complaint, though she was confined to her bed with a broken bone which refused to knit, she said, "God hath sent me into the world for no other end than to love Him; and by His great Mercy I have loved Him to that degree that I can love him no longer after the Way of Mortals. 'Tis time then for me to go to Him that I may love Him after the manner of the blessed." Her mode of expression would remind one somewhat of the Little Flower under similar circumstances some 300 years later. After all, there is not much room for great diversity of expression in an unchanging Church.

It is rather difficult now to determine under whose influence the first edition of the excerpt from the life of the good Armelle was chosen for printing in the Colonies. Christopher Sowr himself, the printer, knew that his German clientele in Philadelphia were rather inclined to the mystical, and he published other mystical works including à Kempis and Fenelon. He may have taken up this work of his own accord, but its French origin makes that more than a little dubious. Mr. Wilberforce Eames, the well-known bibliographer of the New York Public Library, suggests that very probably Anthony Benezet, the Quaker school teacher, who was teaching in Germantown at the time of the appearance of the first edition, may have suggested the publication. Perhaps the foreword to the reader is by him, and in that case he is responsible for an expression in it which smacks more than a little of bigoted misunderstanding of nunneries. Armelle, by the advice of her confessor, took up the position of portress at the Ursuline convent. He was inclined to think that she might there develop a vocation for the cloister. After a trial for several years, Armelle found the work too easy for her, for she found her union with God most profound when she was in the midst of very hard work. She gave up the convent post then to become a domestic servant, where there would be much more of physical labor for her to perform.

The anonymous author of the foreword says:

By this circumstance the Lord taught her and her friends that piety and religion were not confined in nunneries; and that the outward cloistering of the body without withdrawing the heart from the world, never mortifies the spirit, though, perhaps, it might color and hide the inward corruptions of the soul. An heart humbly resigned to the will of God is the temple wherein the Lord manifests His secrets.

All her life, however, after this convent experience, Armelle looked upon the good Ursulines as her dearest friends, and it is to them that we owe the preservation of her story of her spiritual experiences. When she came to die she asked to be buried in the chapel of the convent and her wish in the matter was fulfilled, though they insisted on burying her before the grand altar while her humility asked for a peaceful parcel of earth anywhere within the chapel. The Chapter of the Cathedral of Vannes desired to have her body buried within the Cathedral so much was she thought of. Her heart enclosed in lead was taken as a relic by the Jesuit College, one of the members of which composed for her tomb the following epitaph:

Here lies the body of
ARMELLE NICOLAS
A peasant by birth, by occupation a servant
Commonly called
THE GOOD ARMELLE
And in the ineffable communications
She had with God
THE DAUGHTER OF LOVE
She died on earth to live in heaven
October 24, 1671, aged 65 years
Pray for her soul and walk in her steps
By loving God as she did
Requiescat in pace, Amen

The Jesuits had been dear friends and her favorite guides in spiritual difficulties. This destitute, ignorant servant counted herself as greatly indebted to them and wished to have her heart with them forever, and they accepted this simple heritage.

How Stands the Advance?

HILAIRE BELLOC
(Copyright, 1930)

THE Catholic Church is advancing throughout the civilization of our time. It is advancing in ways which can be measured, as, by numbers and by the wealth of the population attached to it, and by their political power; it is advancing much more in the far more important ways that cannot be measured.

I think that when you take a survey of modern Europe over the last thirty years, and especially over the last decade since the end of the War, that is the chief phenomenon you notice; and it is obvious and unmistakable as much to those who deplore it as to those who welcome it; nor am I myself insisting upon it here from any desire to emphasize what is a comfort—for to put things out of proportion in order to create a false security is the worst error one can make in history or in contemporary judgment—but because I recognize the thing to be as it is.

Here I use as an example the advance in Great Britain and I ask myself how that advance now stands? At what stage in the conflict have we arrived?

In all struggles there are three phases pretty clearly marked: contact, fluctuation and decision. The two parties begin by being out of touch one with the other. Next, they come into touch, and grow conscious of the nature of opposition they are meeting. Then each attempts to obtain advantage; in this attempt there is nearly always come and go, and for a longer or shorter period the issue hangs doubtful; then comes (usually with remarkable suddenness) the conclusion or decision. One of the two is quite apparently the victor; and after that moment every circumstance necessarily flows in his favor, and that with which he was at issue has become negligible.

You can see those phases pretty clearly marked in the long business of the extirpation of the Faith in England from an unwilling, bewildered and reluctant people.

Contact is not really taken until the middle of the sixteenth century, when there comes for the first time after the death of Henry VIII the realization on the part of those who were determined to uproot the national religion, that it was "the Mass that mattered."

From about 1550 onwards you get for 130 years a fluctuating conflict. During the first half of that time the movement to and fro, if you count realities and not externals, is continual. That which governs (notably the Cecils, father and son) is all on one side; but the result remains doubtful.

In the second half, though the Faith is losing ground continually, on balance fluctuation still goes on.

Then, with the end of the Stuarts, comes the sudden decision. The battle is won by the enemy, and the Catholic Church in England falls into a small, negligible body. It ends by being less than one in a hundred numerically, and in moral weight in English affairs something much nearer zero.

Now, in our modern reaction against all this, the parallel hitherto only attaches to contact.

Let us not deceive ourselves in this matter. In spite of the national and traditional antagonism to Catholic ideas and things, no widespread or conscious interlocking of forces has yet appeared. What is beginning to appear, and what is always the forerunner of such interlocking of forces and consequent fluctuating efforts at decision on either side, is a comprehension by those opposed to us of the nature of what they have to meet.

The spread of this consciousness is slow; it has not yet proceeded very far. Numerically the great bulk of our fellow-citizens still think of the term *Catholic Church* as applying to something quite other from what, in reality, that term does stand for. They think of it as a sect; one out of many. They think of it as a congeries of individuals following more or less regularly certain rituals.

Most of them do not know what ideas underlie the practices. Even those who know what the ideas are, for the most part mistake them for opinions and habits, and do not dream of the consistent philosophy, of the sense of reality upon which the whole depends.

To the great majority, still, the Catholic Church is also essentially alien. Their country begins for them with the moment when it ceased to be Catholic, or, when they read and think of their fathers before that date, they read and think of them more or less as though they had been modern non-Catholic Englishmen.

But there are already apparent in a small but growing number two twin appreciations. One is the appreciation of logical power in us, the other is the appreciation of a general or moral appeal.

In other words, the two main facts which opposition to the Church has always had to meet, the fact that the Faith is based upon reason, clarifying and strengthening the reason and spreading and convincing through the reason, and the fact that the Faith appeals to and satisfies the whole nature of man—whereas nothing else does so—are making themselves felt.

So far as I can judge this is not working most strongly in the field of doctrine—and that for a very good reason, namely, that most of the people around us have abandoned doctrine in despair. Rather is it being felt in the field of history and still more in the field of physical science.

In the field of history the advance is slower because

example is less direct. True historical reconstruction destroying false history can always be set down to bias, and it takes a long time for a fully established set of historical truths to pierce.

Moreover, there is in history a vast official legend holding all the educational system, repeated in every textbook and taken for granted in every examination. The whole Whig interpretation of history with its heroes and villains and legal theories and political ideals is one block of anti-Catholic propaganda, and still permeates all the schools.

But in the field of physical science we have two great advances, one, that of surprise, and the other, that of concrete, easily observed example. For the triumph of the Church in the field of physical science was exactly what our opponents least expected. It was taken for granted that in this matter every advance would leave us at a further disadvantage. It has not done so, and that for the excellent reason that truth confirms truth.

The position of the Catholic mind in the matter of physical science was in contrast with that of the non-Catholic mind upon this simple issue: that hypothesis should never be stated as fact. The clear Catholic doctrine that hypothesis should never be stated as fact is mortised into such a concrete bed of hard reason that it was bound to outlast its opponent; and that is what is now happening everywhere throughout the world, and even here.

The point is not that the Catholic mind is distinguishing itself especially in research or discovery—in these activities it is moving as all move today, giving its fair quota, but no more than its fair quota. No, the point is that over and over again on some received, approved but unproved doctrine, when it begins to be used as an attack on true philosophy, those who challenge are commonly Catholic; and are in the issue invariably proved right.

They are invariably proved right not because they have greater knowledge, but because they have a better mental process, because they are used to defining first principles, and to distinguish between affirmation and evidence.

In this line the progress is already apparent, will be continual, and I think within a generation more marked than in any other.

FAITH

"Must I submissive bow to earth my head?
Restrain the restless daring of my mind?
Bound by the palimpsests of men long dead,
Live in the daylight as a man made blind?"

"Yea, lowly bend thy stubborn neck and knees,
And thou shalt win what thy proud ardors seek.
This pathway leads to kindled mysteries
That none have ever seen except the meek."

"Never for me such craven sacrifice!
Bravely I go upon a lonely quest.
I will not fold my hands and close my eyes
To gain an easy and ignoble rest."

"So thou hast courage? Test it. Thou shalt find
Precipitous the pathway to be trod.
Summon the utmost valiance of thy mind.
Only the audacious ever win to God."

THEODORE MAYNARD.

Laymen on a College Council

EUGENE WEARE

WE HAVE doctors out here in the Middle West who care more for the health of the patient than for the fee involved in his case. We have some lawyers who refuse to accept causes in conflict which are dishonest even though legal. We have mothers who continue to bear and to rear large families—and brag about it. My representative in Congress drinks hard liquor on occasions and admits it and I know one or two editors who print what they really believe to be the sound view on a given issue despite the howls of the advertising department. My wife darns socks and my neighbor's wife bakes bread. Our babies—or, at least, some of them—get off to bed each night before twelve, drink no gin and, so far as I know, smoke few cigarettes. From all of which it will readily be seen that we *are* making some progress.

The all of which, however, may be hardly worth mentioning except insofar as all these are indicative of the trend of our times. We are advancing, progressing, making headway. We are stretching up and out and forward—and the end is not yet. If you have any doubt about this, hearken to the tale I now unfold of what recently happened in Chicago.

From the time to which the memory of this man runneth not to the contrary it has been the fashion among the wise men of our generation to bewail the difficulties which are inseparable from any attempt to launch successfully a worth-while program for Catholic higher education in this land of the free. There is hardly a Catholic college or university in this country—*none* that I know of—which is more than about three jumps ahead of the sheriff. All are compelled to live a hand-to-mouth existence in the costliest and most highly competitive business in all the world.

It is Big Business, too. If you have any doubt about that statement ask any Rector, Religious Superior or college president. You cannot construct any kind of a respectable college building nowadays for less than a quarter-of-a-million dollars and a real, honest-to-goodness library costs, at least, a cool million. The lay instructors in Catholic educational institutions—we have not sufficient Religious to go around—have to eat and wear clothes, just as do their brethren on the faculties of non-Catholic colleges, and seek to get, at least, half as much as do these other ladies and gentlemen, by way of compensation for services rendered. Educational costs of all kinds have mounted sky-high and the revenue to meet these has increased but little.

Our Catholic schools and their problems are no exception. These institutions—where they are not actually "broke"—are badly bent. Our Catholic institutions—schools and colleges—if they are not to risk being legislated out of business, must maintain standards of educational equipment and facilities identical with those of other institutions and, of course, are finding it almost

impossible to do so. In other words, our Catholic schools and colleges, dependent solely upon the voluntary support of our Catholic people, are trying to do that which the richly endowed institutions, or the State-supported institutions, find impossible and the result is just what you would expect it to be.

The problem is not that we have not qualified instructors, nor is there any confusion regarding the purpose of our system, or the proper methods by which to train our youth along sound educational lines. We have an abundance of talent among our faculties and a tremendous advantage in that many of our teachers are Religious men and women who make of their task in the classroom a life's work without pay. Our greatest problems are not of a purely scholastic nature but of business management and operation, problems of finance, of building and rebuilding. Big Business is with us in our schools and a way must be found to cope with it.

The Jesuit Fathers at Loyola University in Chicago have recently inaugurated a plan which is important and which ought to command the lively interest of all of us who have at heart the success of our whole Catholic educational system. A few days back, at a dinner held in the most exclusive club in Chicago, an Administrative Council was set up by the Loyola Trustees and is composed entirely of laymen. There are nine of them, each conspicuous in the Middle West as a gentleman of achievement and distinction. Not all are Catholics; the Chairman of the Council is a convert. But all are noteworthy because of what they have done and are doing in the busy life of this confusing civilization of ours. Better still, all are "sold" on the principles of Catholic education—all are agreed that the invitation to a place on this Council provides an opportunity *for them* to serve a genuinely worthwhile cause.

It is well within the facts to suggest that for the purposes for which this Administrative Council has been formed no university in the land can boast of a more formidable group than the one which now functions in the name of Loyola of Chicago. The Chairman is Col. Stuyvesant Peabody. At hardly more than forty years of age, he directs more than a dozen industrial enterprises, including the Peabody Coal Co. and the coal-ice-building material combine which goes by the name of the "Consumers Co." The members of the Council charged specifically with the financial problems of Loyola are Charles F. Clark, vice-president of the banking firm of Halsey, Stuart & Co., Matthew J. Hickey, president of the investment banking firm of Hickey, Doyle and Co., and Samuel Insull, Jr., who is the president, or board chairman, of a dozen and more public-utility companies in Indiana, Illinois, the South and Southwest. The specific problem of buildings and grounds, operation and maintenance has been assigned to David F. Bremner, president of Bremner Bros., large makers of biscuits, and to Edward F. Cudahy, Jr., president of the Cudahy Packing Co., whose family name, for

several generations, enters into any discussion having to do with things to eat.

For the very important task of public relations the Loyola Trustees have designated two nationally famous publishers and a successful insurance man. Detailed to this work on the Administrative Council are Edward J. Mehren, vice-president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., whose books and periodicals cover the industrial and commercial fields of the present day and Peter J. Angsten, president of the insurance firm of Angsten, Farrell & Co. And then there is Martin Quigley who stands as a sort of "patron saint" in the eyes of all journalists, authors, artists, playwrights, actors and polo players; the thirty-five-dollar-a-week Chicago reporter who grew to be in a few years the president and owner of a highly successful publishing business and the editor *who actually edits* half-a-dozen very profitable magazines.

Surrounded by such a group it is not difficult to gather the full import of a statement which was issued recently by the President of Loyola. To the newspaper reporters on the day after the organization dinner Father Kelley said:

It is our conviction that the distinguished personnel of this Council and the reputation of its members will add greatly to the prestige of Loyola, give continuity to its business policy and a more efficient financial administration. Because of the widespread interests and varied activities of its members the Council is in a unique position to advise the President in all matters pertaining to the material and financial policy and development of the university and to enable Loyola to form closer contacts with men and women, of all faiths, in civic and public life.

As part of its task this Council will specifically concern itself with the planning and development of improvements in the physical structure of the university and in the development of a sound financial program. The Council will supervise the investment funds and create additional funds for scholarships and "chairs." In addition, the Council will set itself to the task of establishing student loan funds and a fund for retiring allowances for lay members of the faculty. Problems that will likewise come within the task of the Council are such as will have to do with the extension of the university campus, the purchase and development of property, the erection of new buildings, the strengthening of the colleges and schools within the university, and the addition of new schools and departments. The Council will review the annual audit and budget of the University, stimulate and accept gifts and bequests and nominate candidates for honorary university degrees and for certificates of distinctive public service.

Now the important thing about all this is not so much that a whole series of troublesome problems will be met and handled by an active group of successful business men whose wits are attuned to such a job. That, of course, is, as we say, *something*, and ought not to be overlooked in any discussion bearing upon so difficult an experiment. But, overriding all this, and of vastly greater significance, is the fact, evidenced by the willingness of these men to serve, that outstanding leaders in the world of commerce and industry are alive to the needs of our times. And that is the thought I had in mind when I suggested at the outset of this discussion that we are making some progress.

It happens that the men who make up this Council of Administration are men of deliberate thought and measured judgment. These gentlemen did not accept a place on this board simply because a very charming priest invited them to do so. Membership on boards of trustees is commonplace with them. And it is as certain as the night which follows the day that they did accept only because of a conviction that there is a task to be done and a responsibility on their part to cooperate mightily in the doing of that task.

Witness, if you please, this statement:

It seems to me that the opportunity is ripe for a careful scrutiny of the modern tendency in education to minimize, or to overlook entirely, the importance of religious training and religious instruction. . . . Thinking men and women everywhere have long been gravely concerned regarding the almost total lack of respect for authority now so widespread among our modern youth.

But what can you expect from a system of education which, when it is not definitely and specifically godless, excludes from consideration any reference whatever to Christian ethics as a mode of living and puts it down as a smart thing to sneer at the old-fashioned teachings of decency among men and women, of justice and fair play concerning the rights of others. The system of education at Loyola, which is based upon definite *moral* principles by which success in life is measured by spiritual and cultural values and not by mere material attainments, ought to command the admiration and support of all of us who have at heart the well-being of our youth and the future stability of the nation.

That statement might have been written by the Bishop of your diocese, or your sadly harassed pastor, everlastingly on the hunt for more and larger collections in order that he may keep the parochial educational wheels a-turning; it might have come from the pen of an eminent educator, alive and alert to the trend of the times. But—it did not.

An all-around sportsman of the Middle West is the author of this profound treatise on modern education. Between sun-up and sun-down the man who wrote it finds time to direct the activities of a dozen huge businesses and find employment for upwards of a hundred thousand people. It was handed to the newspaper men of Chicago upon the authority of this newly appointed Administrative Council of Loyola University and Chairman Peabody never batted an eyelash in the process. It is a *conviction* with him and his confreres—and he said so.

Are we progressing? We are.

PIERCED QUIET

Acquaintance might have told her walls had been
Like shaded wood-aisles in their first faint green;
Her pictures pale, her rugs moss-soft, moss-hued;
With mist-gray curtains blending to the mood
Of spring, cool, passionless; warmed by the gleam
Of casement-patterned sun. But who would dream
That the abruptly vivid scarlet vase
Would stand alone above the chimney place,
Tangled and dripping with long sprays of red
Disturbing bitter-sweet that boldly bled
Upon the twilight of the room; a raw
Sword-cut through its tranquillity. I saw
No hint in her habitual reserve
Of such pierced quiet. But I could not swerve
My startled mind from sensing counterpart
Of that bright troubling wound within her heart.

EDITH MIRICK.

Critics and Heretics

G. K. CHESTERTON
(Copyright, 1930)

MR. ALFRED NOYES has written a very telling and topical little book of essays, which ought to have considerable effect; for it is humorous and hard-hitting and hits many things that are all the better for being hit. It is called "The Opalescent Parrot" and the title is a symbol that is also a summary.

Some of our latest literary experimentalists in eccentricity and novelty, or at least those who are chiefly praised for eccentricity and novelty, have a peculiar taste in parrots. As bird fanciers, they seem almost unable to fancy any other bird. Leaving on one side the rich competing charms of the flamingo, the hornbill, and the duck-billed platypus, so alluring to many of us, they almost tend to make the poem about the parrot a fixed form of art. (As Keats wrote the Ode to a Nightingale and Shelley wrote the Ode to a Skylark, the Great Poet of the twentieth century will be almost forced to announce himself with the Ode to a Parrot.)

I have not a word to say against parrots, to whom St. Francis would doubtless have been ready to preach at any moment, with whatever effect. I am fond of bright colors; I do not specially object to loud voices; and I do recognize a certain genuine touch of oriental imagination and mystery in this passion of the new poets for the colored birds.

There is a touch of that feeling in the medieval Italian story, in which the traveler exhibits the feather of a parrot, pretending that it is a feather of St. Gabriel. Even a minor poet can feel that there is a sense in which both seem to come from mystic trees in undiscovered lands.

I am willing, therefore, to lash myself into a frenzy of poetic sympathy on the subject of parrots. Only, as Mr. Alfred Noyes hints, a parrot has other qualities besides those of exotic origin or enameled plumage, of flaming color or fantastic shape. He has also the peculiarity of always saying the same thing; and only saying it because it is all that he has been taught to say.

In this part of his allegory, I think Mr. Noyes is particularly pointed and true. He shows that the fantastic has become a fashion, and even that already stale sort of fashion that we call rather a convention. As he expresses it, the parrot who was once taught to say, "Thank you, Mr. Longfellow!" has now been taught to say instead, "How Victorian! Give me Lytton Strachey!"

But he is only saying it as a parrot; and the literary clique in which he says it is none the less a parrot house for being a screaming parrot house. There is possibly even less real independent individual judgment than when all the parrots were taught to thank Mr. Longfellow.

Certain things are accepted in a lump by all the moderns, mainly because they are supposed (often wrongly) to be rejected with horror by all the ancients. The Muse, that mysterious being, the Modern Girl, is supposed to like a list of disconnected things, bobbed hair and cock-

tails and "Ulysses" and the works of T. S. Eliot. But if a man, daring to exercise his private and personal judgment as well as he could, should come to the conclusion that bobbed hair is nice, cocktails nasty, T. S. Eliot admirable and "Ulysses" a dingy experiment in *argot* like an artificial poem in thieves' slang, most of the moderns would not know what to do with him or where to place him.

And Mr. Noyes himself is in many ways in the position of such a man. Nothing could be better than the passage in which he points out how the moderns pick out certain favorites among the ancients; and take their transcendence for granted more traditionally than the ancients did. For instance, Edgar Allan Poe, as Mr. Noyes points out, has been reverently set apart as a modern before the moderns and used almost to illustrate the unreality of the Victorians; probably from some vague (and very much exaggerated) impression that he was wicked.

Poe was something much more important than a modern or a Victorian; he was a poet. But it would be just as easy to make fun of him as a Victorian as to condemn him or admire him as a modern. In some ways he was even more dated and artificial than the worst that could be urged against the pomposity of Tennyson or the sentimentality of Dickens.

Mr. Noyes gives some effective extracts; and there are scenes in this world of curtains and sofas and chandeliers that are like so much bad Bulwer Lytton. This is not disparaging the great poet Poe; it is simply using our own intelligence in an independent fashion. It is simply realizing that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and that there are a good many young birds about who are none the less geese because they specialize in sauce.

On this point, therefore, the fact that what pretends to be a revolt of realism is already a routine of unreality, I think Mr. Noyes has completely made out his case. Curiously enough, although he and Miss Edith Sitwell are for some reason perpetually pitted against each other, it was Miss Sitwell herself who quite recently said exactly the same thing. Presumably goaded to madness by the admiration of her followers, she cried out suddenly, with great sense, upon the absurdity of having a society where *everybody* is fantastic.

Mr. Noyes then goes on to give another example of real intellectual liberty, as distinct from intellectual anarchy that has become merely intellectual monotony. I refer, of course, to his well-known attack on Bunyan; which was received with all the consternation of those who are hit where they are not used to being hit, or threatened with hitting.

I do not propose to go into that question now, which involves large religious problems; but I do wish to mark it as the occasion of saying that these literary discussions

will become more and more lucid as they become more and more religious. And as Mr. Noyes, I am very happy to say, was received into the Church some time ago, he is especially in a position to understand what I mean and to work out what I hope for.

We shall not get the tale of the modern and recent writers and thinkers told intelligently until it is told as a study in heresies. By which I do not mean that we should blame them for theological errors of which they were quite unconscious, and which they had no guidance to avoid. I mean that we shall assist and enlighten ourselves, in making sense of the story, because we alone can fall back on the old intelligent human custom of defining errors as errors, and tracing them to sources.

We shall not blame the Victorians for being vague, since they could be nothing else. But it will save us from being vague, if we can say, "It is the Calvinist fallacy that misleads Ruskin here," or "Dickens is very nearly right, and would be quite right but for his Pelagianism."

It is upon one or two points of this sort that I differ from this book, which contains so much with which I agree. I think Mr. Noyes does sometimes fall into the error he chiefly rebukes; that of setting generations generally against each other; and wishing to whitewash Victorians as Victorians.

For instance, I am deeply distrustful of Carlyle; not because he was a Victorian or praised or over-praised by Victorians; but because he was a heretic, and that of a deeper sort than Dickens or Tennyson. Even Mr. Noyes cannot persuade me that Carlyle did not really disregard Justice, when it was apparently overwhelmed by Success.

I will not develop the point here; but there is a passage in the *Life of Frederick the Great*, dealing with how his hero probably felt (and was apparently right in feeling) about the justice or injustice of his claim against Maria Theresa, which I should like Mr. Noyes to look at before he is satisfied with high-sounding idealism as a balance to brutality.

I can only say that if that passage does not mean that a man may do anything, however abominable, so long as he is strong enough to do it, I can form no remote conception of what it does mean by the laws of the English language—even with the assistance of the Scottish and German languages as well.

But Mr. Noyes will excuse me for imitating his theory of independent judgment, in what I say about Carlyle. You should see what he says about Bunyan!

I do not need to be told about the howl of misconception and mental confusion that will arise in the world around us as it is today, at the very suggestion of a revaluation of the Victorians by their theology, which was necessarily the basis of their philosophy. Those who imagine that we are plotting day and night to burn our friends and neighbors alive will have no difficulty in imagining that we contemplate an armed raid upon Poets' Corner and the pleasure of digging up English authors and hanging them from the Westminster lamp posts, like the regicides after the Restoration.

But we are in for this interlude of indignant muddle and mad accusation in any case, and that about much more important things than literature or the literary men of recent times.

What I mean, at any rate, is consistent with the most unfailing gratitude and the most unexhausted enthusiasm for those great Protestant men of genius who made the English culture of the nineteenth century; it is simply an attempt to study what they themselves would have called their wanderings in an unwandering and unwavering light, and to apply to some of the noblest men in history that lost and neglected thing, a moral science of mankind.

Consider the Business Man

RICHARD DANA SKINNER

THE relationship between bills of lading and the inner spiritual life of the business man makes an interesting study. From the mere fact that he toils and spins, that he has rent and insurance to pay, meat, groceries and clothes to provide (not to mention meeting possible garage bills on a possible flivver) the unhappy business man can easily assume that his chances of finding spontaneous favor with Providence are rather less than those of the field flowers. Yet we know, both instinctively and by teaching, that all these troublesome tasks can be directed toward the inner life almost as effectively as long meditations. The main questions are: how, when and where?

It would be folly and presumption to try to answer here what the Church in her ancient wisdom and rich human experience has answered so completely through the ages. My thought is merely to suggest the deep and abiding need for a constant freshening and remoulding of those answers to meet the unquestioned hunger of the modern layman.

We have an abundant literature on the spiritual life, but I venture to say, from my limited exploration of those works, that one would find in them but rarely the mention either of bills of lading, or of telephones, ledger accounts, sales curves and employment methods. Members of Religious Orders are helped, and mightily, in giving a spiritual meaning to the least task of the day.

In the writings of St. Teresa, let us say, we can find out how to put up with the faults of fellow-Religious, and how to turn a headache into a spiritual savings fund. We can learn where the paths of true humility lie. We can catch dim reflections of those astounding inner favors which must never be sought, but which must be accepted, if they come, with the joy of complete dependence and gratitude.

There are few, if any, such guides to the business man. He must, if he would seek the companionship of God in his daily work, reshape for himself the all-embracing truths which he finds in the Imitation, or in kindred illuminations of the spirit.

Suppose, for example, we consider the problem of a man entrusted with executive responsibility for a large office. He finds under his control both men and women, of many differing religious convictions, and some, per-

haps, with no spiritual belief at all. They come to him with their problems, their small office jealousies, their faintly concealed ambitions, their numerous ideas and their long lists of objections to this and that. Some of them may be of the office-politician type, conducting definite intrigues to undermine authority and secure advancement for themselves.

In dealing with all these cases, where is the manager to draw the line between charity and justice, between personal humility and executive authority? Are there not a dozen times every day when, apparently immersed in executive routine, he can make a quick mental prayer for guidance—as simply as if he were putting out his hand to get the reassuring grip of a friend? Perhaps a collection letter must be written to a delinquent creditor, a letter threatening legal action. The results of that letter may affect the entire life of the man to whom it is written. It may bring him suddenly to a sense of his responsibilities, or, if he is in honest difficulties, and the letter is too severe, it may crush what little courage he has left and start him on the road to blank middle-aged failure. Where can the office manager find his guiding intuition? He is both trustee for his firm's interests and a human being whose decision will affect other lives. If his egotism, or desire for praise, gets the better of him, his letter will aim only at prompt "results," and justice and long-sighted wisdom may suffer. Is it visionary to suppose that a moment's interior prayer for guidance may, once more, strip him of personal interest, and help him toward a just decision?

My point is not to make any criticism of the extraordinary and fruitful literature of the spiritual life which the Church has provided for centuries. Within its meanings can be found answers to every problem which the layman must meet and solve. But I do believe that with amazing growth in the complexity and distractions of modern business life, there has also grown a definite need for a special literature of the spirit interpreted humanly, and by example, for the harassed layman. This is especially true in a day when the prevailing national philosophy is a gross inversion of the mystic command, "Seek ye first the Kingdom."

We have had it from the highest public platforms that we must seek first material security and the abolition of poverty in order that, with a full stomach and contented fireside, our spiritual forces may have the chance to develop. The precept has been reversed to read "Seek ye first all other things, and the Kingdom shall be added unto you."

Our minds are in constant danger of being twisted by this new formula of economic determinism. The layman needs a fresh infusion of the old truths, interpreted to him, not in terms essentially of the cloister, but rather of his own daily life. He needs to understand the unity of thought, the firm grip on outer realities, the clarity of vision and the greater effectiveness in his human relations which come with a simple application of the spiritual mysteries and paradoxes. He needs an awakened intuition of the meaning of the sacramental life. He needs to understand how possible it is to hold the hand of God in the office as well as in the dim arches of a cathedral—

the inner and full meaning of a morning offering—the strength that comes only when personal pride is relinquished for manly dependence on a higher Will. He wants to know how, in the screeching subways, in the dizzy elevators, at the crowded desk, he may walk, and work, and love humbly and richly under God.

Education

Unpractical Education

JEROME BLAKE

FOR a number of years a myth has been current in our country to the effect that youth's proper armor for defense against the world, and weapon with which to win the battle of life, lay in acquiring a "practical" education.

One result of this fable has been a yearly outfaring from the universities, colleges, even secondary schools, of youth eager to put to the test the "practical" learning they had absorbed. Impatient they were with studies usually grouped under the head of "culture." What good were these, anyway? Hadn't they gotten in the schools the "practical" facts pertinent to their chosen pursuit? Facts were what one needed; facts and still more facts! In engineering courses, hadn't they actually assembled machines and motors, built structures, even mined and treated minerals? In their shop practice, hadn't they operated lathes, planers, shapers, presses, boring machines on various little jobs? And in the summer vacation periods, hadn't they "taken off" their required "credits" in visiting industrial establishments where they jotted down more or less voluminous notes on what they saw?

Of course, all this was at the expense of cultural training. But one could not be expected to absorb that too in the feverish pursuit of the "practical." After all, what good was culture, anyway? What was the good of Latin and Greek? You couldn't use them unless you were a physician or a lawyer; and even then you could "get by" with a very slight smattering of these mouldy tongues. French, Spanish, and German, were all very well if you were going into foreign trade, where a little of the commercial lingo might help you out, but on the whole you didn't really need these tongues. As for logic, ethics and esthetics—bah, those were quite a waste of time!

What malevolent sprite first tolled us up this blind alley, I know not. Perhaps it was our craze to "beat the game," to get something for nothing, a weakness prevalent in America. Whatever it was, it has done its foul work only too well; so well, indeed, that today we have many college graduates who are hopelessly in the rear, in subordinate posts with no hope of promotion, in occupations all taste for which has long since vanished; an ever-swelling group of malcontents who feel they have been bilked, but who cannot define the reason. The matter was tragic enough did it but involve the luckless principals. Unfortunately, they are not the only sufferers; the entire nation shares in the blight of this hoax. Thus we observe college men who are looked to in their community to express the thought of the citizenry on

matters vital to the public weal, but who, having only the haziest of notions—if any—on the trend of affairs in the nation and the world, are constrained to leave it to those who have “specialized” in public affairs and government to solve the problem of the moment as they serenely list.

Rarely does a cultured man of means permit his son to matriculate at one of these “practical-education” mills. Such an one almost invariably enters his offspring in a school noted for its thorough training in philosophy, abstract natural science and the classics. It seems strange that so many of our Catholic people of means have not discerned this fact. They are acute enough in other matters to warrant the belief that they will not always content themselves with playing second fiddle in the American orchestra.

Catholic educators, clerical and lay, who have perceived and deplored the trend toward over-emphasis of the practical in education, may be pleasantly surprised (as was this writer) to learn that unqualified approval of their attitude has been voiced in an unexpected quarter.

Some time ago, at a meeting in Brooklyn of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, there was delivered an address entitled: “Wanted—An Unpractical Education.” The title must have struck oddly in the ears of many of the audience. Yet the speaker was no crank. He was Mr. John C. Parker, vice-president in charge of engineering, of the Brooklyn Edison Company; a man who had taught for seven years in the engineering department of the University of Michigan. Presumably Mr. Parker’s opinions have been well received by important groups in engineering circles, for the address was published in full in the July issue of *Mechanical Engineering*, the official organ of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

I think many of us will agree whole-heartedly with most of Mr. Parker’s opinions. Others of us will find it bitter to reflect that only at this late day are the thoughts here expressed being given serious consideration by the engineering profession, industrial leaders, and teachers of engineering students. Mr. Parker seems to be well qualified by training and experience to discuss his subject, for he combines in his person the viewpoint of father, teacher and employer. His arrangement of the order of significance of those interested in the education of our youth may not be wholly acceptable to some. To others it will appeal. He names the student first, the parent second, the employer third, and the teacher last. His objections to what passes for education in many schools he sums up thus:

My complaint would be rather that training youth to earn a living is not education at all; second, that a specific training may keep the youngster from earning the best kind of living; and third, that it can’t be done in school anyhow.

Many endowed schools there be that seem to have lost sight of the truth recalled by Mr. Parker in the following:

I assume that it is not a legitimate function of educational institutions to take the funds of society as a whole to fit certain particular individuals to earn a living through advantages not universally enjoyed. On the other hand, I conceive the real purpose back of State support, back of the social support of education, to be the fitting of students to live richly and fully

and to contribute most broadly to the welfare of the social group who have paid for their education.

Whether this be the true purpose of education or not, for this boy of mine I am considerably more interested in whether he shall be able wisely to spend and fully to enjoy what he earns, than I am in the amount of those earnings, or the ease with which they are acquired.

I would infinitely prefer that education fit him for happiness and decency in poverty, than for wealth acquired through the sacrifice of himself and his character.

Mr. Parker next calls attention to the fact that youth can absorb only so much learning in a given time in school; and he points out that particular training in a too narrowly defined art may make the student a victim of tragic incapacity for expansion to fit his opportunities. He reminds us that we have all seen pitiful cases of stagnation, of inability to adapt self to changed conditions; and he infers that this plight is chargeable to constricted or meager fundamental training.

Mathematics come first with Mr. Parker in his discussion of study subjects; and this is natural, for Mr. Parker is an engineer. However, he favors pure mathematics over the “applied” kind. As for courses in pure and applied science, he holds that these should deal with “objective truth rather than with speculation or opinion.” With this I am sure we can agree. Further, he assures us that “the whole atmosphere of school and of life is necessarily and essentially different”; that the life of the student in school is artificial—and should be; that attempts to simulate the life of the workaday world can result only in cheating the student; that “. . . teaching of practice may be the teaching of bad or obsolete things.”

I could wish that all our Catholic youth contemplating a “practical” course of study might learn that this engineer vice-president of a large corporation, a former teacher of engineering students, holds the conviction that:

What little of practical training may be necessary can very quickly be grasped by a young man fundamentally and thoroughly educated through his contacts in the only school of practice—life itself.

His query put to the teacher is also of prime importance:

Can he not—*must* he not—recognize that it is more important to educate and to develop men for life, than it is to satisfy the whims and caprices of students, or of possible employers, or even to offer those courses which a president or a board of trustees ask of him, as a cheap form of parlor trick?

In conclusion, Mr. Parker has this to say:

And so it is, gentlemen, that as the victim of a university education, as an employer, as a father, and as a teacher, I am putting out my advertisement calling for an unpractical education, in the full assurance that the right kind of unpractical education is the only kind that is most practical; and just in proportion to the shortness of the period that the individual can spend in school, would I lay more stress on his getting from school those values which can be had nowhere else, so that the least favored shall have the assurance of a more nearly even start with those who can spend more time, and perhaps, in the graduate school develop particularized training.

It seems that some excellent arguments for the kind of education to be had in the Catholic school are found in the address of this former University of Michigan professor and present corporation engineering executive.

Sociology

"Claim to Be Catholics" in Jail

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

A MODEST five-page pamphlet published by the Rev. Francis J. Lane, Catholic chaplain at the New York State Reformatory in Elmira, will answer the question out now and then, "Why are there so many Catholics in Sing Sing?" In your locality, it may be Folsom, or Joliet, or Columbus, or Charlestown, but, wherever you are, I venture to think that the answer will be the same. As a lead to the pertinent facts, find out, first, how many of these prisoners come from a "broken" home. Then find how many of them ever attended a Catholic school.

You will discover a majority of "broken" homes, and a minimum of attendance at any Catholic school—and there you have the answer. But let us take up some of Father Lane's data.

From July 1, 1928, to June 30, 1929, 753 prisoners were admitted to the Reformatory. Of these, 402, or about fifty-three per cent, "claim to be Catholics," writes Father Lane. These figures would show on their face that Catholics are over-represented at Elmira, since Catholics form, at an estimate, not more than thirty per cent of the population of the State. But when we turn to examine the home conditions from which these young prisoners came, we begin to understand why they are prisoners. About fifty-one per cent (207) are drawn from homes broken by divorce or separation. Of the other homes, many have been thrown out of normal by crime, sickness, destitution, or by the death of one or both parents. Of the parents, about sixty per cent were "irregular" in attending to their religious duties. What this "irregularity" means may be inferred from the fact that barely forty per cent of the entire parent group were present at Sunday Mass "most of the time."

It may be assumed, then, that a majority of these young delinquents grew up in an environment that was distinctly unfavorable to religious and moral development. Not all the parents were criminal or disorderly (although some undoubtedly were) but very many were deplorably remiss in providing for their children. Minute investigation might disclose in some instances, perhaps in many, unfortunate circumstances traceable to destitution. These are the cases which could be prevented, or at least relieved, by public and private agencies, thus averting reformatory sentences. But the larger question of the amount of juvenile delinquency arising from such destitution as is directly attributable to want of economic opportunity, has never been closely studied. Nor is it likely to receive the attention which seems called for, until it can be made with due deference to the economic system which at present regulates—or dominates—this country. We must not forget that while poverty, embraced for supernatural reasons, is a virtue, destitution is nothing of the kind. Quite frequently it is the result of sins that cry to Heaven for vengeance, perpetrated by wealthy employers of labor, and it is often the fertile source of irreligion, immorality and crime.

Becky Sharp was wrong when she said that anyone could be good on £10,000 a year, but that old Saint (was it St. Theresa?) was right when she remarked that most people could pray better with a cushion under their knees. An austere assumption of penance, self-denial, mortification, and the rest, is splendid, when we restrict its practical application to ourselves. But to acquiesce in the fact that the hungry and the cold and the ragged will always be with us, and hence what can we do about it, is an attitude as un-Christian and diabolical as any that I can imagine. For, as St. Thomas teaches, the use of at least a minimum of bodily and external commodities is necessary for the practice of virtue. It is easy to go to Mass of a Sunday, when you know you are coming home to a nice, hot breakfast—but not so easy when you must trudge along after drawing your belt a notch tighter.

So much, then, for the parents, delinquent or destitute, of these young prisoners. Now let us see what Father Lane has to say about the prisoners themselves. I fancy that a similar investigation in your neighborhood will yield similar results.

Fifty-three per cent "claim to be Catholics." Unfortunately for this claim, their Catholicism was not the kind praised by St. James. "The average time since their last reception of the Sacraments was thirteen and one-half months." To the priest and the Catholic student, this fact unrolls a volume of data. It means that religion had almost faded out of the lives of these young men. It not only means no Sacraments, but, probably, no prayers, no Mass on Sunday, and spiritual starvation. They were Catholics by the fact of baptism, but not by training or practice. Indeed, only about twenty per cent even claimed they had attended Sunday Mass regularly. Most of these, Father Lane writes, were first offenders.

A majority of the prisoners had spent their time in poolrooms, speakeasies and roadhouses; "300 of the 402 Catholic young men admitted and even boasted of having been regular and frequent visitors to these dens of vice." Their parents do not seem to have been their companions on these visits, comments Father Lane, and he points out that many of them were utterly unaware of what their sons did with their time. "After interviewing hundreds of these fathers and mothers, they would admit that they did not know of their son's 'hangout' until notified by the police that their boy was 'locked up.'"

Given parents of this careless, incompetent, or criminal type, it need not be said that few of them attempted to provide their sons with any training in religion or morality. They did not themselves frequent the Sacraments or attend Mass regularly; their children copied the pattern set by them, and went beyond it.

The school history of prisoners is always significant. In the present study, it is all but determinatively significant. Of the 402 Catholic inmates, 286, or about seventy-one per cent, attended the public schools. Barely twenty-nine per cent attended a Catholic school, and of this minority, only half got as far as the sixth grade.

The picture which Father Lane puts before us is not new, but he presents it in a way that cannot be ignored. Most of these prisoners received little or no education

in religion and morality at home, and less in the schools which they attended. No other result but a career of disorder and crime could be looked for, and beyond the corrective wards of Elmira loom the felon's cell and the electric chair.

What are we going to do about it? We have a responsibility that cannot be evaded.

With Scrip and Staff

MR. FRANK SHEED, the London Catholic publisher, now visiting this country, tells of the heroic efforts being made in Great Britain by the members of the Catholic Evidence Guild to force a hearing for the Faith—that hearing which, Hilaire Belloc says, it is beyond mortal power to obtain. Six hundred speakers—four hundred men and two hundred women—are engaged in the work of telling once Catholic England of her ancient religion: talking on the street corner and the high road and in the public parks. (I notice, in passing, the announcement of Mr. Sheed's lecture on the Guild at the Catholic Club in New York on February 19.)

Apart from the "lunatic fringe" that usually turns up at these meetings, or professional anti-Catholic hecklers, the most striking feature, according to Mr. Sheed, is the apparent apathy of the mass of listeners, who stand with averted faces, motionless, expressionless, "as if the wind had blown them together." Yet the apparently indifferent ones return, day after day and week after week; they stand there in rain, slush and snow; and from their number come the inquirers after the truth. The hecklers, on the other hand, when properly managed, simply help to enliven the proceedings. The standard topic for heckling, is, of course, the ever-favorite and ever-mysterious subject of Confession.

These, frequently, bear witness to the incredible ignorance of religion which exists in the so-called Protestant but truly pagan mass of the population today. Even after months of attendance at open-air instructions, one such individual stubbornly maintained his thesis that, in the Catholic Church, "women go to confession to the priests, and men to the nuns"; and departed in the end convinced of only one thing, that the speakers were simply in conspiracy to conceal the awful truth.

Yet discouragement seems unknown to the open-air apostles, who put in some nine consecutive hours of speaking every Sunday in Hyde Park.

THE well-known difficulty of getting a public hearing for religion, when unpleasant truths have to be told, has been shown in the cynical indifference of our times to the brutal persecution of religion in Soviet Russia. The recent Encyclical of our Holy Father on this subject comes like a thunderbolt, to arouse a negligent and slothful world from its lethargy. And this lethargy has crept into the world of Catholics as well, who have far too little realization, not only of what fellow-Catholics have to suffer in the realm of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, but of many millions of fellow-Christians as well, who are only separated from us by a difference of obedi-

ence, and the consequences of that difference, but are largely one with us in Faith, sharing with us most of our holiest teachings. For the severing sword of Private Judgment, as an all-sufficient rule of faith, though it has reached many of the more educated groups in the Orthodox bodies, has never been the guiding rule for the Orthodox masses.

The mention of "atrocities" provokes a sneer. We were "fed up" on "atrocities" at one memorable time; and the word has become something to bandy about, to shoot off at one another as the Chinese troops were supposed to do, that we learned of in the good old days, who warred by exploding fire-crackers at the enemy.

But many fraudulent "atrocities" cannot make an actual atrocity less real. What has happened, what is doubtless happening at this moment to wretched victims is known with documented certainty to Pope Pius XI. The difficulty is not any uncertainty about the facts of the persecution. It is simply that they have become so familiar that familiarity has bred indifference.

SPEAKING at the immense gathering of protest which took place in Albert Hall in London on December 19 last, Viscount Brentford remarked, after telling a few of the most painful facts:

But it is not merely about that I want to speak to you tonight. I wish to speak of the deliberate effort to destroy religion. They have tried persecution and terrorism and now they are trying political action and education. Churches and synagogues have been confiscated and destroyed, some of them turned into clubs, theaters, and cinemas. Christian Baptism is forbidden. Religious weddings are forbidden. Sunday no longer exists throughout that great country, and the Cabinet has now entered upon a deliberate scheme to blot out the name of God.

The true aim of the whole business was set forth by Prebendary Gough:

The mission of this appalling reaction which is called Bolshevism—its mission is the complete destruction of human life, the complete rooting out of all those qualities that hitherto have been regarded as human. That is the purpose of the thing. Men are to be massed; they are to be mechanized. Freedom and spontaneity, which have been the joy of humanity throughout the ages—all those things are to be mechanized, crushed, brutalized out of human life, and there is no way in which this can be done if there is left in the heart of man any likelihood of returning to a belief in God.

No more striking confirmation of these words need be found than the ferocity with which, according to the daily reports of the Associated Press and the correspondents of our leading dailies, the Soviets are trying to strip from millions of helpless people the elemental foundation of a decent life; not only the ownership but even the free use of the land; and condemning these millions to that most hopeless existence on earth, that of a disfranchised, demoralized rural proletariat.

NOR does the fact that some groups may oppose the Soviet regime for merely political ends, or that issues may be confused, Bolshevism cried without cause, or other misinformed or unenlightened things done, change the essential facts and the essential issue at stake.

Various other "alibi's" are at hand to evade the actual

issue. We were told ten years ago that the anti-religious craze was only a phase, which would pass with the passing of war hysteria. But today it rages more violently than in 1918.

We were told that it is "oriental psychology"; that we should not judge Russians as ordinary mortals. Yet as soon as there is question of establishing business relations with the Soviet and its works, we are carefully instructed how the Bolshevik is really a good fellow; how affable are the judges and commissars, how kind their wives are to the little children, and how they are really quite like the folks back home.

Western contact, it is said, would dispel all this. As one contemporary remarked, our best "bed-side manner" would quiet the anti-religious fever. But Americans, not to speak of British, Germans, and every other kind of Westerner have toured and conversed and "contacted" without end during the last few years. And every "good-will" tour is followed by harsher restrictions, more brutal outbreaks.

IN view of occasional professions of Soviet "religious freedom" the change made in the Constitution of the USSR, during the Fourteenth Congress of the Soviets in Moscow, April, 1929, is significant. Article 4 had read as follows:

In order to provide the workers freedom of conscience, the Church is separate from the State and the school from the Church, while freedom for religious confession and anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens.

In its new form it reads (*italics ours*):

In order to provide the workers actual freedom of conscience the Church is separated from the State and the school from the Church, while freedom for *religious and anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens.*

The true meaning, however, of this "freedom" was explained by Lunacharsky, the People's Commissar on Education, in an article published in the official *Izvestia*, June 8, 1929, stating:

By our religious tolerance we simply conveniently limit the field of struggle and decline to use a worthless weapon. Our country is still full of a great number of various sorts of believers. To challenge them to a final decisive battle, to proclaim them persecuted because of "prohibition of faith" would mean that we become supporters of the priests, because by such means we would immediately cast a significant part of these masses into the arms of the priests....

Religion is like a nail; if you hit it on the head you simply drive it deeper, and in the end may fasten it so tightly that you cannot even grasp it with the pincers to draw it out. We need pincers to get hold of religion, not to drive it in, but to pull it out by the roots, and this can be done only by scientific propaganda, moral and artistic education of the masses, in particular the growing generation, by the reconstruction of habits, by the injection of more and more science into all work and especially that of the peasants. Our Constitution does not speak of lessening the struggle with religion; it chooses for us the manner in which we can most easily overthrow religion, if only we are able to be energetic to the end.

From this, says P. B. Anderson in the *Christian East* for Winter, 1929-30, "it is plain that the Government desires and intends to eliminate religion, but finds it expedient to proceed tactfully and by educational methods."

OUR Holy Father asks for two things, protests and prayer. That protests, when world-wide, continuous and outspoken, based on established facts, and not on mere rumors, do have a profound, even if not an immediate effect, has been shown by recent developments.

The effect of prayer no man can gauge, nor what the intercession of the great Patrons of Russia, St. Basil, St. Cyril, St. Methodius, St. Vladimir, and of our own St. Thérèse as well, may accomplish.

Of all Mr. Sheed's picture of zeal, no item is more striking than the place given by the Catholic Evidence Guild to prayer. For every hour of speaking there is an hour of adoration, by each speaker, of the Blessed Sacrament. For 3,000 hours of speaking, last year, there were some 3,000 hours of adoration. On the Feast of St. Joseph, Guardian of the Child from the massacre of the Innocents, will ascend a world-wide petition to the Heart of Christ in behalf of Russia's millions of innocent little ones, defrauded of their God and robbed of their birthrights by men whose power, like all things opposed to the Most High, cannot endure forever. THE PILGRIM.

HE WHO RIDES THE SKY

There is a white
horse under my body
in the deep night.
There is no star,
there is no moon,
yet we ride far.
Nothing is under
us, nothing above,
yet like thunder
we gallop on.
There is no sunset,
there is no dawn,
only a black night
filling a void—
no sound—no light—
only the sighing
of breath from our nostrils
as we go flying—
only the white
of the white horse
in the black night.
There is no track,
there is no trail,
forward or back—
Demon and ghost-god,
man and the hunted beast
not here have trod.
(I feared no ghost,
I loved no maid,
I slaughtered a host.)
There is no noon,
there is no season,
there is no moon,
yet I mark noons,
I know the seasons,
I count the moons.
I, who was clever,
eating up people,
ride on forever—
only the white horse
under my body,
keeping the course.

ELIOT KAYS STONE.

Dramatics

Plays Worth Discussing

ELIZABETH JORDAN

ONCE in a while, but not too often, New York audiences like to see a play that has the power of briefly fixing their attention on the next world. If such a play is amusing in spots, as was "Outward Bound" a few seasons ago, so much the better. If it is not amusing it must be sustainedly serious and dramatic and must make the spectators imagine that they are thinking deep, deep thoughts.

These final and simple requirements are admirably met in Walter Ferris' adaptation of Alberto Casella's play, "Death Takes a Holiday," which Lee Shubert is presenting at the Barrymore Theater with Philip Merivale in the leading role of Death; and at almost any luncheon table or dinner table, these days, one hears at least two of one's fellow-guests discussing it with a respectful zest that makes them forget the shad roe and the strawberries. We all dearly love to show that we can be serious and thoughtful and intellectual, and even reverent at moments (if these last are not too prolonged), and the new play gives us a chance to show that we can be all these things. So Death's visit to our stage, which was as unexpected as some of his visits to our homes have been, and where he was not warmly welcomed at first, seems indefinitely prolonged; and there are optimists among us who feel that his stay in such friendly guise will do us good.

Probably only an Italian would have written the play as it stands. Certainly only a Latin could have done it, with the Latin's blending of imagination and art and reverence and courage. Possibly only Philip Merivale could act the leading role, and could keep several of the most dramatic scenes safely on the right side of the narrow line that separates the superb from the absurd. Certainly both play and player are fortunate in their association, and as the drama progresses one experiences an increasing faith in Ferris's work as adapter.

The bald theme is simple enough, and very Latin. Death, puzzled by man's horror of him and by man's frantic clinging to existence, becomes a man himself, for three days, that he may experience all man's passions and emotions and thus learn why man so over-values life. He decides to add himself to a house party given by an Italian Duke in the latter's great castle, and the scene in which he abruptly appears in his familiar guise of black-draped skeleton, to announce his purpose to his terror-struck prospective host, is finely played by both Death and the Duke. At the end a bargain is struck. The Duke is to introduce Death to his fellow-guests as an old friend, His Serene Highness Prince Sirki, of Siberia, and under no condition is he to reveal the truth about that guest. On the other hand, Prince Sirki is to take on the outward semblance of a handsome, cultured man of the world, and no danger is to touch the Duke's household while Prince Sirki is in it.

"You will be the only person I have ever visited who has lived to entertain me," says Death, who has a nice,

mordant humor all his own. And the experiment is on.

But it is not wholly successful. Death enjoys his new experience, appreciates the attractions of good food and good wines and of free intercourse with his fellow-men. He also admires pretty women and shows it. But the lurking terror under his effective military uniform strikes a chill to the hearts of those around him. They are afraid of him without knowing why. Even the women who love him are terrified by him, though he does his best to reassure them, for he wants the experience of love, too. At last he falls in love with the Duke's daughter, a very young girl, and she with him. In the desperation born of this horror the girl's father reveals the truth and begs Death to spare her. Death loves her devotedly, but he gives her her chance. He appears before her, not as the worldly lover she has known, but as his majestic self, austere and terrible. The girl goes toward him confidently.

"Why, I have always known you looked like that," she tells him. "I think you're beautiful!" And they go away together as the final curtain falls.

That is a nice finish, for why should we all fear death? And there are some wonderful and thrilling moments in the progress of the play—moments in which the audience sits in a state of thrilled attention one rarely sees in any theater. One of these is a scene in which His Serene Highness meets and enjoys talking to one of the few men who are not afraid of him, an heroic young soldier, who wonders why the Prince's face is so familiar.

"You have seen me near you many times on the battlefield," the Prince smiles. The soldier, of course, does not understand the allusion. The two have a charming talk in which His Serene Highness is at his best, wise and witty and philosophical, and, once or twice, quite serious. He tries to discover why the soldier is not afraid of death, but the soldier does not know.

"One doesn't think about it when one is in action," he says. "Too busy, I suppose. And when one isn't fighting what's the use of thinking about it?"

He suggests that it may be the mystery beyond death that most men fear, and Death says very gently that they would not fear—if they knew what it was. "Those who know Death best are not afraid of him," he adds.

But for three days, during the progress of the play, there is no death in the world; and the audience sees the riot of spreading and blossoming vegetation beyond the castle windows, and observes with awe that the cut flowers in jars and vases remain fresh and beautiful.

Of course, there are moments not so successful, moments when the veil of illusion is rent and the audience peers through. But the play draws the rents together as it goes on and, as I have said, the finish is strong and beautiful. One should not miss seeing "Death Takes a Holiday," even if the illusion it creates is short-lived. And it is very short-lived. As the final curtain fell I whispered a request to my companion.

"Let's not talk, going out. I want to hear what the spectators are saying about this. They seemed so unusually impressed."

We heard what they were saying.

"George," said the thoughtful girl in front of me, "I don't see why you choose Blank's for supper. The Welsh rarebits at Smith's are the best in town." And just behind me a man was holding forth.

Poor old Jim would brace up if he'd remember that what we had was a psychological panic," he boomed. "His losses were mostly *paper* losses. His stocks will come back in time."

From across the aisle came a softer note.

"The baby wakes at eleven," a woman was telling her friend, "So I promised the nurse—"

Life is like that. Besides, the after-theater adventure of escaping to the outer air without being trodden under foot in the crowded theater-lobby is apt to keep one's thoughts from higher things.

St. John Ervine's new comedy, "The First Mrs. Frazer," in which Grace George is appearing at The Playhouse, impresses anew upon us the somewhat familiar theory that old wives are best. James Frazer, magnificently played by A. E. Matthews, has lived happily for years with his first wife (also played magnificently by Grace George) and the pair have several grown children. But before the play begins James has fallen in love with a much younger woman, has persuaded his wife to divorce him, and has married the younger wife. The new experiment has gone on a few years, at the rise of the curtain, and James has begun to be conscious of its flaws. His new wife desires to divorce him. She wants to marry a richer man, who, moreover, has a title. James has fallen into the restful habit of dropping into his first wife's home and talking over his troubles. She sympathizes, but not too seriously. Need I add that she still loves him? I need not.

The second wife is determined to divorce James, but James, while he is inconsolable over the prospect of losing her, does not care to bear the brunt of a divorce scandal a second time, especially as in this instance he is blameless. The first Mrs. Frazer learns that the second one is not blameless. She has a private interview with her, reveals this knowledge, applies the social screws, and persuades her successor to elope with the titled lover, thus leaving James free to get a divorce without further blackening his reputation. All very up-to-date and sophisticated, you see (except some of the jokes) and all written with airy disregard of moral standards for any character except the first wife. She had plenty. Indeed, she had so many that perhaps there were not any left for the rest of the characters. The play is amusing, swift-moving, admirably acted and free from vulgarity of line. It is one of the notable successes of the season.

In "Children of Darkness," Basil Sydney and Mary Ellis are giving audiences at the Biltmore Theater a realistic impression of daily life in Newgate Prison, London, in the spring of 1725. The producers, Kenneth MacGowan and Joseph Verner Reed, announce on the program that the play is "in the picaresque manner"; which reminds me of an incident. An infant of three in our family once laid a fat forefinger on a huge, unwieldy animal in a new picture book and asked, "What's *dat*?"

"That," I said, "is a hip-po-pot-a-mus."

The infant did not try to repeat the word. She simply considered it with an expression of deep and growing satisfaction, "Why, y-e-s," she said unctuously, at last, "so 'tis!"

She realized that no other name would fit that particular animal. I repeated her mental process when I read that "Children of Darkness" was picaresque. 'Tis. Very. Now look up the word in the dictionary and then you will know all about the play.

Being picaresque, it has to do with the situation and actions of gentlemen who are in an English prison for various crimes, including debt, blackmail, theft and murder. To prisoners who have money to pay for it, the jailer allows the freedom of his private home, next to the prison, and the unlimited attention of his beautiful daughter, Letitia, a maiden lacking all the virtues. Watching the loves and lusts and hates and jealousies of this precious gathering, the audience spends an evening more or less interesting and edifying, according to individual points of view. But whatever else the play is or is not, it is picaresque. Don't lose sight of that.

Which leaves me only room to say that Eva Le Gallienne's new offering at the Civic Repertory Theater, "The Women Have Their Way," is a delightful bit of Spanish comedy and that her own work in it, as Juanita La Rosa, the heroine, is altogether charming.

This two-act play is written by the Quintero brothers, authors of Otis Skinner's latest offering, "A Hundred Years Old." It is well worth a journey down to West Fourteenth Street. And I may remark in passing that there is nothing better on our stage this season than the make-up and acting of Egan Brecher as a very human and lovable village priest, in whose home the action takes place.

REVIEWS

Franklin, The Apostle of Modern Times. By BERNARD FAY. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. \$3.00.

The author of this book, a French historian who specializes in America, says of it: "I have attempted in this book to give a complete and continuous history of Franklin's Masonic career, and it is the first time that such an attempt has been made." His conclusion is:

Franklin's successes and setbacks, his principles and opinions, cannot be followed or understood unless his Masonic career, with all its implications, is carefully studied. He never could have formed a middle-class political party in Pennsylvania, nor had himself accepted by the British Government, nor—and most important—could he have been able to win over Vergennes and Louis XVI to America's side, had it not been for the invaluable support of his Masonic brothers.

This gives the whole color to a work which is a notable example of technical history in its vast utilization of unknown and unpublished matter. Thus M. Fay shows that Franklin was not an atheist but a Deist, or, as he says, "a follower of the seventeenth-century English Pythagoreans. He believed in metempsychosis, and in a supreme Deity, who was surrounded by innumerable inferior gods, with Christ for one of his prophets." M. Fay claims to have shown that Franklin was not a nationalist in the sense of the other patriots, but believed in a British Empire along the lines of the present Commonwealth of Nations. His one great achievement was bringing in the French on the American side. His great disappointment was the extreme unpopularity he later suffered in America. His political ideas were ignored, as M. Fay well shows, in the making of the Constitution; they seem to have been derived principally from the Masonic circles of France. It is piquant to observe that he shared the idea of

the present junior Senator from Pennsylvania that representation in Congress should be proportioned to the amount of taxation paid by the States. He also fought in vain for a feeble, plural executive, a favorite Masonic device, instead of the single quasi-monarchical presidency which was adopted. His curious mixture of the optimism of Rousseau with the pessimism of Voltaire made him in mind on two counts an alien to America. M. Fay has lots of subtle and quiet fun with Franklin's "sentimental" adventures, especially the seventy-five-year-old patriarch's proposal of marriage to the beautiful Madame Helvetius. The book does full, perhaps too full, justice to the supremacy enjoyed by Franklin in philosophical, scientific and political fields in an age which was in full intellectual decadence. He was "the great bourgeois," and, as such, the "apostle of modern times" in their exaltation of humanity over God.

W. P.

Public Relations of the Commission for Relief in Belgium. By GEORGE I. GAY. California: Stanford University Press. Two Volumes. \$10.00.

This is a collection of documents compiled by George I. Gay and H. H. Fisher from the collection to be found in the Hoover War Library at Stanford University. The title is rather misleading, because the material does not always confine itself to the public relations of the Commission nor are the other contacts of the C. R. B. overlooked. One gathers a clear and definite idea of the privileges, duties, and connections of this unique organization, described by an official of the British Foreign Office as "a piratical state organized for benevolence." In one sense an international public body, it was actually a private organization, without incorporation or well-defined legal status, to which the Governments engaged in war on the western front entrusted responsibilities which no government or public body could discharge. The important phases of the undertaking have determined the arrangement of these documents rather than the usual chronological order. Accordingly, the chapters of Volume I deal with activities in the early days of relief and carried on until the end of the war; those of Volume II treat of activities of later origin and briefer duration. The chapter on "Inter-government Settlement of Relief Subsidies" deals with events subsequent to the Commission's liquidation, and the documents quoted are not from the C. R. B. archives, but are extracts of international treaties and agreements regarding inter-government debts. The final chapter is practically a recapitulation of the more important German pronouncements relating to relief. A brief summary of the administrative structure of the Commission and a chronological list of the documents have been added as an appendix.

F. S. P.

Vigil. By A SISTER OF NOTRE DAME (DE NAMUR). New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. \$2.00

The first sentence of Father Gleeson's "Foreword" well characterizes the spirit with which this volume of spiritual essays has been written by a Sister of Notre Dame. "Inspiration, sympathy and strength form the cord that binds these chapters of love," says Father Gleeson. This is a book of spiritual reading intended especially for religious women. It is redolent of that sweet peace and beauty that is found in the cloistered convent and in the cloistered hearts of the Sisters. This peace of place and of soul is a pervading something that is achieved through the harmonizing of many virtues. These virtues are the subjects of the author's essays. The practice of perfection, the love of God and of neighbor, the purity of the vows, prayer, detachment of spirit, loyalty to Jesus and devotion to His Mother, these and the other supernatural virtues are the basis of the discourses. But mingled with them are comments derived from long experience with the purely natural elements inbred in even the best religious. While the author strives to lead her readers into the higher lanes of spirituality, she does not forget that they are human. Hence, deftly but kindly, she points out some of the faults that mar the full beauty of a religious home and soul. Here are many pearls of great price strewn together for all to admire and for those who can to possess.

A. T. P.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Lives of Action.—In 1869 Mother Francis Raphael Drane, O.P., wrote the story of the foundress of the English Congregation of St. Catherine of Sienna of the Third Order of St. Dominic under the title "Life of Mother Margaret Mary Hallahan." Archbishop Ullathorne contributed the preface. Now after sixty years a reprint of this volume, with a foreword by the Very Rev. B. Jarrett, O.P., is announced (Longmans. \$4.20). The story of Margaret Mary Hallahan, who rose from an orphan ward, through the career of a housemaid, eventually to make a powerful contribution to the religious life of her day in England and elsewhere, is both romantic and instructive. The volume is chiefly concerned with her external activities, though the spirit that animated them and her solid asceticism are everywhere manifest and make the story of her life as inspiring and edifying as it is entertaining. Copious use has been made of Mother Margaret's correspondence and the biographer has very prudently omitted interpretations of her own. While the story will edify religious, it should have a special inspirational value for Catholic working girls.

Fully to understand the glorious history of the Church and of Christian civilization one needs to be acquainted with the men and women who have made that history. On this theory W. E. Brown has prepared "Bishops" (Herder. \$1.35), the first volume in a projected series, "Pioneers of Christendom." The study covers five outstanding members of the episcopate during the so-called Dark Ages, Saints Ambrose, Martin, Wilfrid, Boniface and Dunstan, and aims to present them less as ascetics and more as men of action who affected their own day and civilization by playing important parts in the history of their time. All of the studies are sympathetic and informative, and Catholics who may be subject to an inferiority complex about the influence of the Church in the world will find here plenty of material to disabuse them of their wrong notions.

It may be said that institutions of higher education for women are practically an American enterprise. Though only fifty years going in our own country, their influence has been felt abroad. In "Under Five Sultans" (Century. \$4.00) Mary Mills Patrick tells the story of the upbuilding of the famous Constantinople women's college, chiefly through the infiltration of American educational ideals and methods. Dr. Patrick was herself president of the oriental school from 1890 until 1924, when she became president emerita, so that the volume is really autobiographic. Its opening chapters give a colorful picture of Turkey and the Balkans generally, when she first journeyed from her home in the mid-Western United States to begin her professional career in Constantinople. Throughout we see the changes wrought in the position for Turkish women precisely through the educational opportunities afforded them. "Under Five Sultans," which is written smoothly and entertainingly and in parts is highly anecdotal, is likely to have an appeal especially to those interested in the history of education, to school teachers, and to students of the political and social reforms that have been going on in the Near East in the past several decades.

The "Catholic Mind."—The recent Encyclical "On Christian Education of Youth" has been hailed by Catholics, Protestants and Jews, in the pulpit and press. The official English text, which has just been received in this country, appears with full source-notes and an outline summary, in the February 22 issue of the *Catholic Mind* (America Press. 5c a copy. \$4.00 per hundred). Pastors, parents, teachers, members of study clubs and students of education will find it indispensable. Indeed, it is desirable that every Catholic possess a copy of this admirable presentation of the principles of Christian education.

For Junior Citizens.—Three attractive little volumes are sent out by the American Book Company to teach young folks the truth of the assertion that "there is hope for the nation that reveres the memories of its noblest leaders." A very profitable hour could be spent by the elders of the family also in a careful reading of the lessons these books impart. The first of these

manuals, "Founders of Our Country," by Fanny E. Coe, has a self-explanatory title. It includes in its stories appropriate chapters on "The Calverts and Maryland," and "The Jesuit Missionary in America." In "Makers of the Nation," by the same author, forty-odd leaders, heroes and patriots, have been featured with clear, vivid narrative, as being identified with certain great movements and situations. Then in the third volume, "How the World is Housed," by Frank G. Carpenter, the little students become globe-trotters to find out where the materials come from out of which their homes are constructed and how they are prepared for use. The stimulating addition of a number of well-selected illustrations is notable.

For the Hour of Quiet.—A story for the little ones to read or to tell, can be easily found in either of the two volumes of Joseph Burke Egan, "Wings of Flame" and "New Found Tales," both published by the John C. Winston Co., Philadelphia. \$1.50 each. "Wings of Flame" is a collection of "everyday fables." Some of these are about little boys and girls that all of us know; but a great number of the others tell that "there was once upon a time" that a king or a princess or four men lived in a forest or a palace. These stories seem to be for littler people since they are shorter in length and with shorter words. "New Found Tales" is a collection of stories from the magical lives of people from all over the world. They are mostly about times that even grandfather does not remember. The first stories are those about the Indians long before any white men came to them; and then come stories from a long time ago in Australia, and Africa, and Turkey, from Germany and England and Ireland, from China and Japan, all told in a few pages each. Mr. Egan has the gift of simple narrative, touched with that imaginative power that sets the child's thoughts wandering. He draws no morals, but he shows the goodness in his characters that the children should imitate. The little ones would enjoy these tales.

"Communion Rhymes" (Macmillan. \$1.00) is a sweet little collection of verses that begin with each letter of the alphabet. The eight simple lines of each verse tell about something connected with the child's soul. The verses, by Sister Mary Gertrude, have been nicely illustrated by Carle M. Bogg.

Appreciations of Saints.—Sister Rose Anita Morton makes no mistake when she states that "Robert Southwell wrote the poems which gave him the title to being, specifically, the only important religious poet of the Elizabethan Age." Not only of the Elizabethan period is Blessed Robert Southwell the outstanding religious poet, but he is one of the few in the whole English tradition. For that reason, such a treatise as this, "An Appreciation of Robert Southwell" (University of Pennsylvania Press. \$1.50), is valuable. Southwell was a poet; but he was, more than that, an heroic priest, an apostle, a mystic, saint and martyr. In the first portion of this study, Sister Rose sketches, briefly though completely, the career of "Southwell the Man." Such a brief biography prepares for a better understanding of the second, and more specifically intended portion, "Southwell the Poet." Sister Rose examines the prose relics of the poet and enters into an examination of the poet's poems, in themselves and in relation to their times. The whole is scholarly and enlightening, and is concluded with a list of references.

In straight, strong strokes, Hilaire Belloc has once more told the story of "Joan of Arc" (Little, Brown, \$1.75). It is a biographical sketch by way of affirmations. That preserves it from the biographical sin of wandering into side issues. Its brevity helps also to its clarity. In style it is of a quaintness that creates an atmosphere of the contemporary scene. This quality may suggest that the biography is intended wholly for juvenile readers. But that is not wholly true, for adults may enjoy it and learn from it. As a miniature on Joan, it is one of the best available.

A drama of Christ's Passion is the explanatory title of "The Great Achievement" (Boston: Angel Guardian Press. 25c.), by the Rev. Edward F. Crowley. The play is in five acts, covering the betrayal, the announcement to Mary, the condemnation before Pilate, the death of the Saviour, and the assembly on Good Friday night. The play might serve those seeking a Lenten production.

Relics and Angels. My Outrageous Cousin. The Foreigner in the Family. Fool's Goal. All Our Yesterdays.

Another bacteriologist frustrate goes through his struggles in "Relics and Angels" (Macaulay. \$2.50). For financial reasons Tony Clezac, an expatriated Southerner, sacrifices his scientific ambitions to become Second Vice-President of Forward Shoes. The experiment is a failure from the start, partly because Tony has nothing to do, partly because he is temperamentally unsettled, and entangled with women. In the end, when he has made his choice and is preparing to go back to his research in Europe, he is stopped by a scruple of conscience and the reader takes leave of him, doubtful whether he has had a religious conversion or merely gone crazy. Either alternative, the author, Hamilton Basso, would seem to imply, conveys the desired impression of futility. It is just too bad; but life is like that. A foreword to the novel promises something more about these characters. Many readers will hope for better news. Otherwise even the fresh directness of Mr. Basso's dialogue and his unquestionable pictorial power will not compensate for his sordid and one-sided picture of the "new South" and his ignorant caricature of Catholic liturgy.

There is no telling what a romantic young lady will do—if only she is romantic enough. Marian Richards Torrey makes that her justification for dragging out the story of Zandrie Donallon's infatuation for Julian Furness, the title character of "My Outrageous Cousin" (Macmillan. \$2.00). If many things in the story seem far-fetched, not to say incredible, the reader has only to recall that the heroine is romantic—and the hero outrageous. No *deus ex machina* could ever prolong a story like this. Only the death of the hero—and it has to be a Sidney Carton end to atone for his outrageous conduct—can finally do what two marriages failed to do, break the spell of the romantic young lady's infatuation and give her to the arms of the faithful young lover who has been recounting the story. That is a rather doubtful prize. The moral implications of the book are not superior to the construction of its plot.

As an attaché of the League of Nations, Wilfrid Benson may be credited with a desire to bring about a better mutual understanding between the French and the English. Still, however good his intentions, it is more than doubtful that his pleasant little satire, "The Foreigner in the Family" (Harcourt, Brace. \$2.50), will be conciliatory to either one nation or the other. A promising situation—Robert de Boncourt's first visit to his wife's English family—develops rather too suddenly and too exclusively into a series of compromising accidents, all too confirmatory of the English idea that all Frenchmen are immoral, in the most restricted sense of that word. A happy denouement throws the laugh on the English suspicions, but not before the always equable hero has been convicted in the reader's mind of what is, for the typical Frenchman, the eighth, if not the greatest, of the capital sins, stupidity. The story might make a passable one-act comedy, but it wears a bit when stretched into a novel.

B. M. Bower tells a story well. "Fool's Goal" (Little, Brown. \$2.00), the latest in a long list by the same author, is a story of the West and a western story. In it, therefore, one finds swift moving action and just enough mystery to ward off fatigue. There is a hero and a villain of the milder type; there are bandits, of course, and a heroine to supply the love story and the happy ending. In fact, while this is not the great American novel that has long been waited for, nor yet the highest form of literature, the book is interesting and refreshing fiction.

An English contribution to the topic of the futility of war is made by H. M. Tomlinson in "All Our Yesterdays" (Harper. \$2.50). It is more subtle in its thesis and in its arrangement than some of the others. There is not one scene of blood and flesh and filth; and there are no hysterics. But beginning from the Boer war, there does grow the impression that this sort of thing is brought on a people by some almost inexorable working out of a destiny they have prepared for themselves without knowing it. In this impression is rooted all the power of the book, backed up as it is with the wizardry of a style that Mr. Tomlinson uses with admirable discretion. But the book misses greatness because this same impression grows without sufficient human interest.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Scholarships for Scholarship

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. John Haggood's letter, in the issue of AMERICA for January 11, an observation on the "Aftermath of the Carnegie Report," contained this sentence: "I don't think that anyone could justly object to a young man who has athletic ability obtaining a scholarship for his services, but what everyone should object against is to allow the same young man to continue in college if he is not succeeding in his studies."

Everyone has a perfect right to object to the awarding of scholarships for any other object than to aid deserving, but indigent young men to obtain the advantages within reach of youths from wealthy families. Again, such scholarships should be granted only to such prospective students as have shown during their high-school course an aptitude for more advanced studies, combined with willingness to profit by further opportunities. That such aptitude and willingness may be accompanied with athletic ability is beyond the point in bestowing scholarships. To enter in college a youth of athletic skill and to expect his progress in his studies to show whether he deserves to be continued on the lists is but to confess that an educational institution should sacrifice the first qualification for admission with the hope of securing a promising athlete. Why not determine this point in advance, in preference to lowering scholastic attainments for athletic success?

A young man with athletic ability but without qualification, or at least with doubtful qualification for scholastic success, should be referred to any one of the sixteen major-league managers. They are honest enough to confess that they are looking for athletes; they are not trying to cover their quest with the mantle of some "dear old Alma Mater."

Louisville, Ky.

(REV.) FRANCIS J. MARTIN.

Current Movies

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The letter by Father Wuellner, S.J., on "Current Movies," in the issue of AMERICA for February 8, asks a question which, perhaps, I am in a position to answer. He wants to know why AMERICA does not issue regular appraisals of the major motion pictures by way of promoting the cause of Catholic progress.

It may interest Father Wuellner and many of your readers to know that more than 200 motion pictures are released by the motion-picture industry every month, and that an intelligent survey of these requires a completely organized reviewing service. This has been accomplished by the Motion Picture Bureau of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae through two Reviewing Committees of forty members each, one functioning in the studios of New York and the other group serving in Hollywood. Their time is so divided over the days and hours of the week that practically every picture released in this country and most of the foreign ones are previewed in the studios and reported in writing. Each month the Bureau issues a printed list of endorsed pictures suitable for Catholic schools, colleges and church halls; for Catholic adult audiences; and for educational programs. The list is a free service and is distributed through State and city chairmen of the Federation throughout the country.

It has been the purpose of this Bureau to wage an intensive publicity campaign for better pictures on the principle that the producers will make that which the public will buy. And, as Father Wuellner has suggested, it has been our consistent plan to present only the good pictures in our review, without pointing to the objectionable ones, for we have learned that to speak of an evil book, play, or picture is to gain it a new audience.

At the present time our lists are going annually to about 100,000 persons. We are broadcasting this Catholic review service on a weekly schedule from nine radio stations: WLWL, New York

(the Paulist Fathers' station); WWL, New Orleans (Loyola University); WHBY, De Pere, Wis. (St. Norbert's College); WHAD, Milwaukee (Marquette University); WKRC, Cincinnati; WEW, St. Louis (St. Louis University); WOW, Omaha, Nebraska; WJAY, Cleveland; and WMAQ, Chicago (Chicago Daily News). Forty-two papers in this country, and several foreign ones, are printing our endorsements.

The direct answer to Father Wuellner's question lies in the fact that this whole work has been made possible by the cooperation and strong encouragement of the Editors of AMERICA, Father Francis X. Talbot, S.J., acting as Spiritual Director of the Bureau. The editorial columns of AMERICA have done more than any other agency to gain priceless publicity for this work. The Apostolic Delegate of the Philippines, reading AMERICA, wrote and made arrangements for the monthly endorsed list to be printed in seven newspapers (in Spanish and native dialects) in the Philippines. A Jesuit priest in Yokohama, learning from AMERICA that the service was available, wrote for the list and for the past year has been booking pictures for several Catholic institutions in Japan from our endorsements. This same thing has happened in Argentina, in Ireland and in Canada.

It will be a pleasure to put Father Wuellner's name on our mailing list to receive this monthly free service. His letter has given us a happy opportunity to express our indebtedness to AMERICA.

Brooklyn.

RITA C. MCGOLDRICK, *Chairman*,
Motion Picture Bureau, I. F. C. A.

Martha Moore Avery

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Recently there was erected a gravestone in a quiet corner of Holyrood Cemetery in the Archdiocese of Boston, which bears a unique inscription—"Convert, from Marx—to Christ." Simple words, but they tell a wonderful story to those who know how they came to be so inscribed. The grave marks the last resting place of Martha Moore Avery, co-founder with David Goldstein (another convert from Marx to Christ) of the Catholic Truth Guild of Boston, lay apostolate to the man in the street.

Those who were privileged to gaze upon the mortal remains of Martha Moore Avery will never forget the sight. Clothed in the brown habit of the Third Order of Saint Francis, with a white crucifix gleaming through the girdle, she appeared as calm and steadfast in death as she had been zealous and valiant in life.

By the life and work of Martha Moore Avery an example was shown to the laity in America to let their light shine across the fields of modern life. Why do we stand idle, tasting the sacramental fruits which the Church offers, but withholding the light of truth from the millions of our countrymen, who, in their hearts, are men of good will? Shall it be said of the Catholic laity of America: "They took all the Church had to give and failed to spread the true Faith in the land discovered by Columbus the Catholic?"

Wollaston, Mass.

WILLIAM E. KERRISH.

On Singing the Ave Maria

To the Editor of AMERICA:

While listening to the Ave Maria being sung in church and elsewhere, I have often been grieved to hear the last part sung, *Sancta Maria, Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis*, etc.

Our Mothers' sublimest title, *Mater Dei*, is thoughtlessly omitted from the prayer which has risen to Mary for centuries. It seems to me that we should show a more jealous and sensitive care, both in public and in private, to salute Our Lady as the Church and God would have us do.

Boston.

D. L. S.

Editor's Note: Readers of AMERICA are again reminded that only communications relating to personal or editorial matters should be addressed to 329 West 108th St. Matters relating to subscriptions, renewals, change of address, etc., should be addressed to 461 Eighth Ave.